

THE

LONDON REVIEW

OF

Politics, Society, Literature, Art, & Science.

No. 178.—Vol. VII.]

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1863.

[PRICE 4d.
Unstamped.]

REVIEW OF POLITICS.

The Twin Ravens of Rochdale.
How they Manage these Matters in France.
Bright Days for Gold.
The Jockey Club "Suppresses" the *Morning Post*.
The *Alexandra* Case in the Court of Exchequer.
Police Spies.

An Unhappy Wife.

Lord Clarence Paget on Naval Gun-
nery.
The Court-martial upon Lieutenant-
Colonel Crawley.
Knox v. Gye (Letter from Mr. Gye.)
THE CHURCH :—
The Saints and their Legends.—No. III.
Improvement of Small Livings.

CORRESPONDENCE :—

Church Reform.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS :—

Battlefields of the South.
Queens of Song.
Modern Pantheism.
Greece and the Ionian Islands.
Christmas Gift Books.
Short Notices.

FINE ARTS :—

Music.
The Queen's Gift to the National
Gallery.

SCIENCE :—

The New Catalogue of Nebulae.

MONEY AND COMMERCE.

Meetings of Learned Societies.
List of New Publications for the Week.

REVIEW OF POLITICS.

THE detachment of a considerable portion of General Lee's army to operate either against Burnside or Grant, has enabled General Meade to make a rapid advance, to cross the Rappahannock, and to gain some advantages, which, if not very important in themselves, will no doubt be found useful in restoring the morale of his army, which must have suffered from their recent precipitate retreat almost up to the fortifications of Washington. At the same time it should be remembered that the Federals are no further on their way to Richmond than they were at this time last year, and that they are now on the point of again encountering the difficulties and obstacles which proved insurmountable to Burnside and Hooker. It is true that their present general appears to be far superior to either of those unfortunate commanders, and his late movements have been marked by a strategic ability for which the Confederates were evidently unprepared. The latter would seem to have been taken by surprise in the actions at Rappahannock Station and Kelly's Ford, and the want of vigilance thus displayed undoubtedly lends support to the rumour that Lee himself is not now in Virginia, but has taken the command in Tennessee. We have no news of any great importance from that State, but the recent disaster to General Burnside's outposts at Rogersville shows the direction in which a portion at least of the Confederate forces is operating. From Chattanooga we have only the intelligence that all is quiet; and we may, therefore, take it that the Federal position has been ultimately found too strong for direct attack. Indeed, if it be true that the Northern Government are about to reinforce General Grant with 30,000 men, it is probable that that enterprising and skilful commander has resolved upon attempting an advance. A letter which has appeared during the week from the *Times'* correspondent at Chattanooga confirms the impression which we had previously begun to entertain, that the Confederate forces in that quarter have been badly handled, and that through General Bragg's timidity or want of decision the splendid victory of Chicamauga has been attended with little or no advantage. This writer's account of the condition of the army is very discouraging, and does not warrant us in expecting much from it, so long as it remains under its present chief. The Federal batteries and Fort Sumter still continue their resultless duel at Charleston, but we hear nothing of the employment of any iron-clads in the bombardment. Even the Northern journals have ceased to anticipate the speedy capture of the rebel city; and, so far as we can judge, President Davis is amply justified in the confidence which he lately expressed to its citizens, of being able to defeat any force which may be brought against it.

Her Majesty's Government have refused to take part in the Congress proposed by the Emperor of the French. We feel no surprise at their decision, for we were informed some days since that their assent was conditional upon certain explanations which the author of this ambitious scheme was not likely to render. It was apparent that if he consented to limit beforehand the functions of the Congress, and to define with exactness the pressure to be put upon any recalcitrant Power, he incurred the risk of either narrowing its deliberations within a compass which must fail to justify the convocation of such a body, or he must give such a warning to the Powers intended to be affected, as would probably deter them from assisting in their own dismemberment. The demand of explanations on the points to which we have referred was a friendly but significant intimation of the unwillingness of England to participate in a general discussion of heterogeneous projects for the rearrangement of the map of Europe. And, although there is much speciousness in the alleged reply of the French Foreign Office, that the imposition of any restrictions upon the debates of so august a body would trench unduly upon its prerogatives, it is impossible not to feel that some mode of giving the required explanations would have been found, if Louis Napoleon had had any practical suggestions to offer, which would bear an examination apart from the intrigues and combinations to which a meeting of representatives of the European Powers must necessarily give rise. In declining to send an ambassador to Paris, to discuss they know not what, Lord Palmerston's Government will certainly be supported by public opinion. We have nothing to gain by participating in the deliberations of a congress of diplomats; and, although it is both our interest and our duty to promote to the utmost the pacification of Europe, it is not easy to see how such an object would be furthered by an assembly of this kind. It is idle to suppose that the mere debates of such a body could have any influence upon the policy of the Powers, in whose hands the fate of the Congress really rests. Russia will not make Poland independent, Austria will not give up Venetia, Germany will not respect the integrity of Denmark, France will not evacuate Rome, because the arguments which have already been urged in state papers are repeated in speeches delivered round a green table. Discussion has already done its best or its worst upon most of the questions which keep Europe in a state of disquiet, and every one must see that further talk, unsupported by war, or the threat of war, would prove equally unavailing. At the same time, when several powerful countries have committed themselves before the world to so solemn and pretentious a proceeding as a Congress for the settlement of things in general, it is difficult for them to accept a total failure. All are tempted to trench very

closely upon the boundary which separates peace from war, and the greatest possible facilities are afforded to any of their number who are strongly bent upon particular projects, to force or lead the others across the line. It would be the height of optimism to look for any display of the virtues of disinterestedness and generosity from the European powers at the present moment. And our Government are quite right in thinking that while that is the case, "a parliament of the nations" is likely to be a far more fighting body than a council of war. It may safely be assumed that our Government have ascertained that England will not stand alone in refusing to have anything to do with such an assembly. The Emperor's project has received its death-blow.

The aspect of the Schleswig-Holstein dispute becomes more warlike almost every day. Although neither Austria nor Prussia has yet made any sign, the smaller German powers appear to be quite carried away by the popular enthusiasm. It is an obvious policy for the petty dukes and kings who are not on too good terms with their own subjects, to stave off inconvenient discussions by fostering the natural sympathy for the Germans in Schleswig. Nor is it inconsistent in sticklers for the divine right of rulers, to protest against the sacrifice of the claims of the Augustenburg family to the convenience and the peace of Europe. But an obvious policy is not always a sound one, and if Germany has once more to bear the brunt of a great war, it is not likely that the people will again be content to bear the sacrifices and resign the profit to their princes. It is scarcely possible that the most obtuse of Teutonic sovereigns seriously believes that Denmark will be left to maintain unaided her own integrity and the provisions of the treaty of 1852. But unless they can secure the acquiescence of England, France, and Russia in their projects, the attempt to sever Schleswig-Holstein from the state to which it belongs must entail the risk of a contest whose issues and dimensions are quite uncertain, but which will certainly before it closes reduce every ruler in Germany to a state of abject dependence upon his parliament. However, it is no concern of ours if kings will be imprudent and rashly disturb a *status quo* from which they derive more benefit than any one else. But we cannot remain indifferent to the threatened disturbance of a settlement under which so lately as eleven years ago the succession to the whole of the Danish monarchy devolved upon Prince Christian of Glücksburg. There is an end to all faith in treaties if the powers who signed the one in question are now to set it at naught or to remain indifferent to its execution. We can hardly think that either Austria or Prussia will avail themselves of any flimsy pretext to evade their plain obligation to recognize Christian IX. as King of Denmark, including Schleswig-Holstein. Their signature to the treaty of 1852 was given unconditionally. It was subject to no reservation of any right which the German Diet might possess to pronounce on the succession to the duchies. It bound them, not to Denmark, but to Europe, in whose interest the treaty was confessedly concluded; and even if Denmark has violated other stipulations entered into at the same time, the breach of these does not release the signatories of that treaty from their mutual obligations, although it may possibly furnish an independent ground of complaint against the offending state. This is so clear that, in all probability, neither Austria nor Prussia will venture to espouse openly the cause of the Augustenburg family. The real danger seems to be lest, while nominally respecting the letter of the treaty, these Powers should be driven or tempted to disregard its spirit; lest, while, recognizing the title of the new monarch, they should so far yield to the pressure of German feeling as to push on the Federal execution, which, under present circumstances, can only be regarded as an indirect means of promoting, as it certainly would promote, the dismemberment of Denmark. It is openly avowed that the object of the professed adherents of Prince Frederick of Augustenburg is to secure Kiel as a German naval port; and some enthusiasts at Hamburg have even gone so far as to proclaim that the duchies should be torn from Denmark whether their inhabitants are willing or the reverse. Other Powers, whether they are mainly anxious for the preservation of the independence and integrity of Denmark or for the limitation of the power of Germany, will not see with indifference any steps which tend to the accomplishment of such designs. It rests at the present moment with Austria and Prussia either to give us peace or war. And while we

are willing to hope the best from their sense of the consequences which must follow from the adoption of the latter alternative, we are compelled to fear the worst from their rivalry for the leadership of Germany. Upon their own heads, however, must be the consequences if they afford France a pretext for crossing the Rhine as the ally of the Scandinavian kingdom. However much we might regret such an event, we neither can nor will assist a nation which chooses to pursue its own aggrandisement in the teeth of European opinion and in violation of a recent and deliberate European settlement.

The Prussian Liberals have obtained a victory over the Bismarck Government. Condemned by an overwhelming majority of the Lower House, the arbitrary decree which destroyed the liberty of the press has been annulled by the Royal authority. At the same time the Ministers have, with characteristic insolence and imprudence, deprived this act of any grace which it might otherwise have possessed, by proclaiming that they were quite right in publishing the grossly illegal ordinance in question, and that under like circumstances they would take the same course again. A more serious question is, however, coming on for discussion. The Government have reintroduced their bill for regulating military service, without any alteration in the obnoxious provisions which caused the original quarrel between the King and his Parliament. Under ordinary circumstances we should count confidently upon its speedy rejection; but there are already symptoms of a disposition on the part of the Liberals to sacrifice almost everything else to intervention in the affairs of Schleswig-Holstein. If the King will only consent to separate from M. von Bismarck, it seems probable that he may obtain nearly everything he wishes, and restore his former popularity, on condition of placing himself at the head of the national movement, and marching an army into the Danish duchies. But although they are willing in other respects to let bygones be bygones, and prefer snatching at the port of Kiel, with the risk of causing a European war, to establishing their own constitutional rights and consolidating their own constitutional liberties, a portion of the Opposition will not, it is said, make terms with the Minister by whom they have been insulted. We are told that they will oppose the grant of supplies to the Bismarck Cabinet even in order to carry out the favourite national policy. The majority, however, if we may judge by the resolutions to which they just promised their support, are bent on war at any price. And it seems to us not improbable that, if Bismarck boldly declares for a war policy, he will obtain from the country the pardon of his past offences, and become for the moment master of the situation.

THE TWIN RAVENS OF ROCHDALE.

THE Liberal party may well be in some perplexity, for it is in the habit of hearing daily every species of contradictory report about its own health and character. "Rest and be thankful," says Lord Russell, beaming with good humour upon all of us from Blairgowrie. The words of the Prophet Bright and of the Prophet Cobden, on the other hand, are bitter words; and they teem with reproaches and with denunciations of coming doom. Perhaps the difference consists in the fact, that Lord Russell is rising like a well-filled guest from a long political banquet, to which the Brights and the Cobdens never have been bidden. The *entrées* and the side dishes spoke at Blairgowrie, and the hungry and uninvited outsiders speak at Rochdale. "Rest and be thankful" is a kind of Whig grace after meat. It implies a previous succession of the most luscious delicacies, after which it would ill become the most carnal-minded to repine. The House of Bedford cannot look at human life in a jaundiced way, because the House of Bedford has dined.

Another reason why Lord Russell is tempted to doubt the advantages of prolonged political agitation may perhaps be that Lord Russell is virtually a non-combatant in the Liberal arena. He has mounted to the window, and is star-gazing over the European horizon. Naturally enough he prefers that Englishmen should have no ears or eyes for anything but protocols and treaties, and the diplomatic despatches of the English Foreign Office. The late member for the City is not any longer merely a Reformer, he has become a Power of the first magnitude. Nationalities are all his care, and he deals with nothing on so small a scale as a six-pound householder. It is not to be expected that Earl Russell of the Foreign Office should be plain Johnny Russell of the House of

Commons, the incubator of so many Reform Bills, and the enemy of ecclesiastical abuses. Every hen thinks there are no eggs of any importance to society except her own, and Lord Russell, having for some years been oviparous only at a distance from home, has enough to do in cackling over the eggs that he has laid from Washington to Warsaw.

The tone, on the other hand, in which Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright discuss the genial contentment of so happy and so satiate a statesman, betrays an unnecessary misanthropy and some slight deficiency in a knowledge of human nature. Foreign ministers are not likely to be violent agitators in the Manchester sense of the word. There is nothing that makes men of an ordinary calibre so Conservative, with respect to home politics, as a close study and observation of the politics of the Continent. The same life that has tempered the home views of Lord Palmerston and Lord Clarendon is beginning to tell on Lord Russell. Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright seem to consider it a misfortune that we should occasionally lift our eyes to Europe's broad expanse, and survey the other ships which are drifting down into the future at a little distance from our own. These things, they say, occupy our attention and take us off from self-improvement—from the important questions of reduction of our armaments, and of direct and indirect taxation. England certainly may pride herself on being the best abused country going; and the best abused by her own kith and kin. We have always, in the words of the gentleman in the *Critic*,—"some damned good-natured friend," either at Liverpool or at Manchester, pointing out to us that our conduct is invariably despicable and idiotic. Yesterday it was that frenzied Manad, Mr. Ruskin from Zurich. He is a friend of the people, loves working men, and his objection in the name of a glorified democratic instinct is that we interfere abroad too little. To-day it is Mr. Cobden who condemns us (also in the name of the democracy) for interfering too much. These good gentlemen of the democracy of the future should spare an unfortunate and effete and bewildered country. In the name of horny-handed labour and cottagers, and peasant proprietors, and universal brotherhood, what are we to do? Are we to stay at home and ink our fingers over direct and indirect taxation? Or are we to go to war for an idea and the happiness of the oppressed? As the great leaders of the democracy appear divided upon so practical a point, it may be taken for the present that one-half at least of the abuse lavished on England and on the Liberal party must by the laws of arithmetic be absolutely undeserved.

It is strange that the two representatives of Manchester democracy should contemplate with any satisfaction the break-up of the Liberal Government of the day—except so far as personal animosities and personal ambition enter into the question. Supposing the Liberal party reconstituted, supposing a change in taxation to be a fact accomplished—supposing Government economy to be an acknowledged principle in Government departments—how many scores of questions there must be with which a Parliament of a purely democratic nature would be most unfit to deal! Mr. Ruskin, perhaps, represents the crude theories, the foolish sentiment, the mad vanity, the abysmal political ignorance of thousands of the masses. What would Mr. Bright say to a Parliament of Ruskins? How would the affairs of the country be conducted with a Cabinet of Ruskins? Mr. Bright, perhaps, will reply that he only contemplates an intelligent democracy. The golden age no doubt is coming. A glorified and intelligent democracy, like the Queen of Mesopotamia's peacock with diamond feathers, is coming doubtless with the golden age. But in the present age—in the days of Mr. Bright and Mr. Cobden and Lord Palmerston, and as applied to England—an intelligent democracy is a contradiction in terms. There is positively no such thing, and to long for a general break-up of the Liberal party for the sake of so wild a chimæra is not worthy of the men who carried Free Trade. The triumph of democracy just now, unless it means the triumph of labour over capital, is altogether unmeaning; and Mr. Bright and Mr. Cobden are too good economists and too greatly identified with capital to wish that.

No doubt the Liberal party may gain something by a reorganization, though it will not be in the sense alluded to by the Rochdale orators. But if so, the change must be one which will destroy the antipathies that at present divide the extremes of the Liberal school, not one which will spring whole mines of antipathy and animosity under the feet of all. Whatever, however, the ultimate gain, let us look at the positive and present inconveniences of a disruption. This week an idle rumour has been running riot all over London to the effect that Lord Russell was about to leave the ministry. Lord Russell, with all his noble and generous instincts, is not a very popular statesman. There is a feeling that

he has mismanaged the Polish question, by either want of tact or of decision; and that he is too much in the habit of "roughing" the other European Powers. Though he might be replaced at this moment by Lord Clarendon without much injury to the conduct of the Foreign Office, it is a great relief to every one to know that the story of his removal is groundless. Lord Palmerston's ministry could not have afforded to have Lord Russell loose upon the world. The experiment has been tried and has been unsuccessful. It will not, except as a last resource, be tried again. A Whig out of office, like a horse with his leg weighted and loose on a high road, is nothing more or less than a public nuisance. He gets in the way of the very coach to which he naturally belongs. Lord Russell's resignation would lead in the long run to a ministerial change. How can Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright, as honourable men, pretend, on public grounds, to contemplate without the gravest alarm the break-up of the present Cabinet in the present state of Europe? If the Liberal party be so "infirm," it is a very sad thing for England in the presence of this American war and the Continental disquietude at large. It is a prospect that might move even the Manchester school to something like a generous anxiety. "Enfeebled and sickly" is Mr. Bright's verdict, who feels his party's pulse with a malign curiosity at Rochdale. If the bulletin were true, more shame for Mr. Bright and Mr. Cobden. It seems to be their personal desire to make it true, by painting the Liberal policy of the country in the blackest colours, and by consistently ignoring all that is great and good about those who direct it. To impute motives to such men as Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright would be unworthy of serious politicians. But—it must be confessed—there is a tone of venom which pervades all their speeches on the subject of the Palmerstonian Ministry, and suggests dark ideas of personal pique and jealousy. Whose original fault it is that there is a breach between the two great Freetraders and the more educated bulk of the Liberal classes it is difficult to say; but such speeches go a long way towards widening the gulf that already yawns between them. Mr. Cobden and his friends have done their best to make a Liberal parliamentary following difficult, and all the gratitude the country owes them for past services is materially weakened thereby.

HOW THEY MANAGE THESE MATTERS IN FRANCE.

THE French Legislative Assembly has recently been engaged in examining into the value of the various election petitions, and in either confirming or annulling certain disputed elections. The petitions presented by the defeated Opposition candidates are usually of the same description, and allege the same species of hardships. Mayors, prefects, gendarmes, all have been everywhere against the enemies of the Government; and during the election, from first to last, the latter have preserved their seat in the Legislature under the most ludicrous difficulties. A somewhat humorous discussion took place, amongst others, on the subject of the election for the district of Meaux, which forms the third electoral division of Seine et Marne. The history of the proceedings is a curious one. The decision of the Assembly was what might be expected; but the comments made on it in the Paris press are so strange as to be almost incredible.

Till the recent general election, a certain M. Gareau was the representative of Meaux, a gentleman of some mark in the Assembly, and though an Imperialist, an honest and impartial man. In all previous contests he had been the official candidate; but it came to pass that M. Gareau fell in the course of the last few years into disfavour with the Government. He had shown symptoms of squeamishness at election times; had demurred to being placarded all over the country as "candidat du Gouvernement," and was looked upon as one of those men who were too independent to be good patriots. When M. Gareau went down to stand in 1863, he found his position altered. The title that had been thrust on him in 1858 was taken perforce away from him in 1863. Another was now destined to hold it, and before his very eyes there started up a rival, under the name and style of Government candidate, in the person of M. de Jaucourt, a gentleman holding a high place in the office of the Minister of the Interior.

Nothing daunted by his change of circumstances, M. Gareau gallantly began his canvass, though no longer with the special patronage of M. Persigny. It was not long before his mortifications began. In the first place his ancient ally, the Prefect of Seine et Marne, turned visibly against him, and at large meetings held contrary to the French law solemnly invited the electors to give their support to M. de Jaucourt. A still more serious calamity followed. The district of Meaux, of all the three districts of Seine et Marne, happens to have the fewest electors, though the difference was not very serious between the three. The Govern-

ment chose this awkward moment for arbitrarily adding to the district of Meaux two cantons where lay the chief property and interest of M. de Jaucourt, the Government champion. The next misfortune that befell M. Gareau was more honourable than pleasant. Wherever he went to address his constituents, he was attended by a suite of gendarmes, a privilege accorded him as an antagonist of the Minister of the Interior. Wherever M. Gareau posted his placards, the gendarmes tore them down, and nine of them were actually tried for the offence. A commissary of police, a *chef cantonnier*, and a gendarme were, moreover, proved before the local tribunals to have spread slanderous reports about him to common people; the gendarme excusing himself for his energy by a naïve apology. "What am I to do?" said he to the friends of M. Gareau. "Gareau does not want his place for his livelihood, as I want mine."

Unlike M. Gareau, the communes of the electoral district of Meaux derived nothing but profit and enjoyment from the contest. Forty thousand francs are said to have been allotted by the Government to this happy region, though the Government orators vigorously asserted that there was an error in the calculation, and that the considerable grants which remained after all deductions might be explained. Lastly, a singular piece of luck befell the inhabitants of the good town of Ferté-sous-Jouarre. In the first place, the town of Ferté-sous-Jouarre received an auspicious advance of sixteen thousand francs from the Executive for the purpose (as the Executive called it) of building a new town hall and school. The second piece of luck came on the day before the poll, at which M. de Jaucourt defeated M. Gareau. A telegraphic despatch arrived from Paris with an announcement of good news for the town. "At the special request of M. de Jaucourt," a reduction had been made upon the railway fares between Ferté-sous-Jouarre and Paris. It is not surprising that the next day Ferté-sous-Jouarre should have done her best to show her gratitude to a candidate so influential, and attended by such windfalls of good fortune.

Such were the incidents of an election against which M. Gareau protested by petition to his old friends and colleagues of the Legislative Assembly. The defence of the Minister was extremely weak. It left untouched the facts as above stated. All that was done was to deny that they had influenced the election, or that any of them had been used by the Government to assist their man. The feeling in the Legislative Assembly was, however, unusually strong. The Opposition, in hopes of a victory, demanded a public scrutiny. The question was put to the vote, and the Government candidate was confirmed in his tenure of the seat by a majority of forty votes. The following is the criticism of the *Constitutionnel* next morning. It speaks volumes, and requires little comment or illustration:—

"Dans la période électorale où toutes les passions s'agitent, la validité des élections ne saurait être infirmée par des instructions que quelques agens subalternes auront mal comprises, par des excès de zèle souvent plus nuisibles que profitables aux candidats qu'ils ont en vue, par des propos de gardes-champêtres et des commérages de clocher dont la justice, suivant le plus ou moins de gravité, peut avoir à s'occuper, mais qui perdent singulièrement de leur importance devant la Chambre des députés. La Chambre est placée au-dessus de toutes ces petites misères qu'on peut appeler les petites misères électorales: elle les apprécie telles qu'elles sont: elle pèse leur influence réelle sur le résultat de l'élection, et si ce résultat lui paraît l'expression sincère et loyale des suffrages de la majorité des électeurs elle en déclare la parfaite validité. C'est ce qu'elle a fait hier pour l'élection de la deuxième circonscription de Seine-et-Marne."

The Legislative Assembly, according to this precious extract, does not concern itself with minor little incidents such as we have related—"Les petites misères électorales." This reminds us forcibly of a certain Latin proverb which is very much in point. "De minimis non curat lex," says the proverb. Lord Brougham is said to have translated it: "Lord Eldon does not stick at trifles." We recommend this translation of it to the *Constitutionnel*.

BRIGHT DAYS FOR GOLD.

MR. COBDEN at Rochdale on Tuesday reminded his colleagues of the Anti-Corn Law League, that it is exactly a quarter of a century since they allied themselves to enforce the recognition of Free Trade principles. Among the most brilliant and undoubted results of free trade has been the rise in the value of money. The future Macaulay will take for his *point de départ* the speech of Earl Grey (then Lord Howick) in 1843, when he moved for a Committee to inquire into the distress of the country. The City then laboured under a plethora of capital. Consols were at 95. Lord Howick drew attention to the sufferings of the class of capitalists. He entreated the House of Commons to look at the unnaturally

high price of the funds, showing the low rate of profits, and the difficulty of employing capital to advantage. The inference to be drawn was and is, that there was not under a protective system sufficient field for the employment of the rapidly increasing wealth and population of the country. Money was a drug, and City capitalists, unable to find employment for their money at home, were compelled to look to Spain, Portugal, and other countries for investments.

Luckily for the capitalist, the artificial barriers and restrictions which unjustly narrowed and confined the field for capital and labour, were broken down. The shackles which confined our industry were removed. A vast increase of imports has produced a corresponding amount of export trade, and has increased the employment of industry and capital. The Bank Charter Act no doubt placed the currency of the country on a safe and secure basis, and it is "pretty to see," as Mr. Samuel Pepys would have said, how promptly the turn of the screw acts upon the foreign exchanges. The Russian war, the Indian mutiny, and the French campaign in Lombardy, had their share in causing the recent high price of money. But will any one tell us what would have been the present state of the money market, if, the gold-fields of Australia and California having been discovered, the repeal of the Corn Laws had not opened new fields for the employment of capital and relieved the springs of industry?

Money is quoted at six and seven per cent. at the Bank of England and the chief establishments. And yet our shrewd and well-informed City correspondent was enabled to assure our readers last week, that when you ask the question, "How is money?" the reply is invariably the same: "There is plenty of it, and the majority of the dealers have full balances." Now, remembering the great and general distress which existed in 1843, when Lord Howick drew attention to the low rate of interest on money, we may be permitted to express a doubt whether any class of the community has reaped safer, richer, and more solid advantages from Sir Robert Peel's Free Trade measures—carried to their full completion, as Mr. Cobden reminds us, by the present Parliament—than the great bankers and capitalists of the City.

We once heard a great millionaire repeat with much naïveté a piece of advice which he had received from the first Lord Ashburton. "Always (said that great merchant) keep a balance of £100,000 at your bankers." If there are any City capitalists of a bygone generation who follow this advice, what halcyon times do they not live in! The Bank of England pursues an uninterrupted career of prosperity. It regulates the monetary concerns of the Continent, and plays the rôle of monarch of the kingdom of finance, to the honour of its directors and the signal profit of the concern. The shareholders, with Bank stock at £235—237, have at least no reason to be dissatisfied. The great London bankers buy landed estates, portion their daughters liberally, pay their income-tax cheerfully, and bequeath a bulky and highly satisfactory piece of parchment to the care of Doctors Commons. The joint-stock banks divide fabulous profits and bonuses, and furnish a "sensation" section to the ordinary City quotations. A London and Westminster share, upon which £20 has been paid, may, it seems, be bought for the ridiculously small figure of £79. A Union Bank share, on which £12 has been paid, may be had for £39. A share in the London Joint-Stock Bank, on which £10 has been paid, may be bought for £37. The London and County Bank has called up £20 on a share which cannot be bought for £55. The City Bank has called up £50 per share, but the share may be sold for £110. The Provincial of Ireland £25 shares are at £92. It is needless to exhaust the catalogue, but it is clear that metropolitan bankers and bank managers are at present in high feather. The more adventurous capitalists, with money at command, turn up their noses at 5 per cent., so great is the seeming abundance of more profitable investments.

Yes! these are bright days for gold! Who will paint the "Now" and "Then" of Lombard-street—the period before Free Trade when bankers refused to allow any interest on surplus balances or on money left on deposit at call, and the present post-Free Trade period when the banks offer their customers the advantage of promptly transferring any surplus balance to a deposit account bearing interest? How pleasant to parties who do not keep accounts with banks to be invited by safe and prudent undertakings to leave money on deposit at, say one per cent. less interest than the minimum rate of the Bank of England! The uninitiated may wonder how the banks make their profit out of so slender a margin; the City men have good reason to know that considerably more than the Bank of England rate of interest is charged upon five-sixths of the commercial bills afloat.

Let us suppose a country gentleman who has been paid off a

large mortgage, or who has come into a considerable legacy. He scans the City articles with a new zest, looks at the price of foreign securities over his first cup of coffee, and of mines and banks over his second. He assiduously applies himself to learn the present value of money. Is he duly grateful to Sir Robert Peel and Adam Smith? Perhaps his memory carries him back to half a dozen periods of alternate currency inflation and severe agricultural and manufacturing distress; but if a sense of the existing high and steady rate of interest for money should come over him, he would attribute it, by some unexplained process, to the gold discoveries, and not at all to free trade. When his eye wanders over the monetary intelligence and the railway advertisements, what does he find? Australian Government Six per Cents at 110-112; Russian Three per Cents at 54. Tenders for loans on the debentures of railways and other public undertakings everywhere meet his eye. The London and North-Western Railway Company will receive his applications for their perpetual Four per Cent. Debenture stock. The Great Eastern and other companies, not of the very first class, offer him a Four-and-a-Half per Cent. Preference stock. A host of minor railways advertise for loans on debentures without stating terms, the inference being that they are prepared to give 5 per cent., and in some cases more. Colonial Trust and Land Companies offer him 5, 5½, and 6 per cent. Schemes for local improvement, in which local rates are pledged, under the sanction of Acts of Parliament, for the repayment of loans, attract our local capitalist with the promise of a safe investment. But these useful undertakings have to bid high for money in these days, and now and then find it difficult to obtain it at 5 per cent. So that our lucky capitalist has only to pick and choose.

Perhaps few people who have effected a modest assurance upon their lives reflect that they, too, participate in the prosperous state of the moneyed interests. It is evident that the life and fire assurance offices *ought* to regulate their premiums and bonuses by the interest which they are able to obtain upon their annual premiums and accumulated capital. For some years prior to 1843, old and safe offices like the Equitable Life Office were obliged to be content with a slender rate of interest. At present the loans, deposits, and balances of the various life offices bring in excellent returns; and as their annual premiums undergo no reduction, a continuance of the present high rate of money will, in the course of a few years, sensibly tell upon their prosperity and upon the sums payable to the assured. Thus, every person assured in a life assurance office is a small capitalist, who will share in the benefit which "s order" are deriving from the operation of a system of unrestricted commerce. There is of course a class who complain of the "dearness of money;" but it is a sound and cheerful faith to believe that the present high rate of interest supplies a powerful motive to accumulation and a new stimulus to industry. Witness the innumerable building and freehold land societies which offer liberal interest to depositors, and whose aggregate investments are enormous.

If, while Lombard-street presented itself to view as joyous and thriving, the industrious classes were complaining of reduced wages and an impoverished condition,—the case of Lancashire is exceptional,—the prosperity of the money-lenders would be an unhealthy symptom. But the spectacle now presented to the working-man, at every swing of the door in our crowded City banks, cannot but encourage him in the formation and practice of prudent, industrious, and saving habits. When he sees his neighbours getting a shilling a year upon every sovereign they have to lend he will see how money breeds money, and try to become himself a small capitalist by means of a little nest-egg in the bank. The trading and professional classes, when they, too, come into the market as lenders and not as borrowers, have equal reason to appreciate the combined effect of the Bank Act and the repeal of the Corn-laws. There has been a steady flow of gold from the diggings, but has gold become a drug? Will it ever become a drug again? So far as we can descry, the days of plethora—the days of a low rate of interest and profits, so justly bewailed by Lord Howick in 1843—are gone; never, it may be hoped, to return. The more gold that comes from California and our southern colonies the greater the number of channels that open for its profitable employment. Every year London becomes more incontestably and more absolutely the *entrepôt* and storehouse of gold, the regulator of foreign exchanges, the great market for foreign securities, the barometer of the European monetary system, and the centre of European finance. Perhaps, as Mr. Cobden said at Rochdale, the best thing that can be asserted of the present Parliament is, that it swept away the last rag of Protection. Nor is the moment inopportune for congratulating the Free-traders on

that remarkable verification of their most sanguine views, which a review of the money-market supplies. Free Trade has immeasurably increased the industrial activity of the people. It has also made a thousand new openings for the employment of capital. And this has been an enormous gain to a country of such immense monetary and financial resources.

THE JOCKEY CLUB "SUPPRESSES" THE MORNING POST.

It is a very awful thing for a newspaper to criticise the proceedings of the Jockey Club. Those Three Great Brethren, the Earl of Coventry, Admiral Rous, and Mr. C. Dupré Alexander, whose duty it is to preside over everything except the morality of the turf, are very terrible in their wrath, and stand no trifling on the part of the press. The unhappy gentleman who, in corresponding for the *Morning Post*, was unfortunate enough to offend them, and who, in consequence, is destined never to see Newmarket races any more, is a perpetual monument of their power; it is only, therefore, in a humble and deprecatory spirit that it is possible to congratulate them on the new logic which they have introduced into the controversies of horse-racing. The sole thing that can be said against it is, that it is French. It is the code of the Tuileries applied to Tattersall's. When the Minister of the Interior at Paris finds any Parisian journalist who ventures to insinuate that a paternal government has its foibles, the Minister of the Interior takes the erring journalist by the button-hole and reasons with him in the most convincing way. What the Government, he says, affirms, this newspaper denies: the only conclusion which can be drawn is that this newspaper must be suppressed. It is the merit of the Three Great Brethren of the Jockey Club to have borrowed this cogent method of reasoning, and so far as their powers enable them to imitate Imperialism, to have adapted it to English soil. The Stewards of the Jockey Club are a wise and a beneficent oligarchy who never, never are unjust. Mr. Willes thinks and says they have been unjust in a particular instance. Then Mr. Willes cannot be allowed to attend Newmarket, or to plant his heretical feet on a course where it happens accidentally that Admiral Rous and his colleagues are trustees of the soil for public purposes.

This is a forcible logic and one that must commend itself to all the high authorities of the Jockey Club. In the first place, the Stewards of the Jockey Club may be said to have devised a wondrous method of putting all critics at once on their side. The world must now choose between fidelity to Admiral Rous, whose word is law, or exclusion from the joys of Newmarket. Admiral Rous is to betting-men henceforth what the Pope is to one half of the world—the Head of the Church—the Father of the Faithful—the Lord of the White Elephant—who has been ordered by his physicians never to be contradicted. This is a very glorious position, and will give the excellent Admiral and his pair of colleagues, not only a pure delight, but a very splendid standing at Tattersall's for all time. A licentious press must not be permitted to tamper with the faith of the Jockey Club, or to sow dissent in that well-regulated body, who have been brought up in the fear of the Admiral from their earliest days. Indeed, we believe it may be said that no other great institution in England has half this immunity except the House of Commons; and the Speaker does not take so solemn a revenge even on the offenders against the dignity of Parliament as has been taken on the unlucky "Argus."

As for the Bishops, they are nowhere in comparison with Admiral Rous. Their enemies may scoff at them in the gate, without being on that account excluded from the privilege of attending divine service. This is a Protestant country, and those who do not believe in bishops still may go to church. They manage these matters far better on the turf. There is unanimity—nothing but the most delightful unanimity—on the green sward. Every shade of colour is to be seen at Newmarket, and every variety of bet; but there is one horse that henceforward it would be mere madness on the part of anyone who does not desire to be turned off the course not to back through thick and thin, and that horse is Admiral Rous. All hail to him! May his shadow never be less! He alone is the fountain of perpetual justice, and so long as he is one of the stewards of the Jockey Club we shall maintain with fervour and energy that he never is in the wrong.

The public in general would possibly suppose that so awful a tribunal judged all offences with equal vigour. This does not quite appear to be the case. If "Argus" had only been a duke who did not pay his debts, or who was a little screwy about meeting bills, he would be all right. The Admiral's moral nature would

have been shocked, but he would not have turned "Argus" off the Heath. The Jockey Club pardon much. They know what it is to be a duke. They are a long-suffering body, and know how to allow for the temptations to which all noble blood is heir. What they cannot abide is newspaper criticism. They feel that it is not what they have a right to expect. It vexes everybody. It unnerves and distracts the Admiral. It is what organ-grinding is to Mr. Babbage, a disturbance and an annoyance to each and all, from Lord Coventry himself down to the very clerk of the course, who cannot start the horses if he is to be exposed to the virulence of a time-serving and venal press. It does not matter however sincerely the criticism is given; silence, and not sincerity, in their eyes are the golden virtues of a newspaper. Probably no one has ever yet been excluded from Newmarket before "Argus" except a convicted thief; and some thieves are not so low in the world as even that. The stewards of the Jockey Club, because they cannot bear free comment, and because technically they have at law the power to oppress a private gentleman, desire "Argus" to stand aside off the course, with the thieves who are unfortunate enough no longer to be permitted to shine there. We think most English gentlemen will be of opinion that, whatever the merits of the original controversy between "Argus" and the Jockey Club, as the matter at present stands, justice and fairness is with him, not with them. With Admiral Rous is probably a hot and peppery temper and the accidental privilege of being able to have his own way at Newmarket, where he is monarch of all he surveys, down to the very horses' tails.

THE ALEXANDRA CASE IN THE COURT OF EXCHEQUER.

THIRTY years ago there was, in all parts of the country, as there still is in some, an agricultural process of great labour and very costly of time. When the grain had been garnered, it had to be beaten out of the ears by the flail, and when that was done, it had to be flung up by successive handfuls in the wind, or before some artificial draught, that the chaff might be blown away, and the corn made fit for market or mill. Now-a-days, all this is done by machinery, to the great relief of human sinews and patience. The threshing-machine takes in at once the sheaf, strips the wheat from its covering, fans and winnows and sifts it, and pours out into the sacks at the other end the clean and assorted grain. Would that such mechanical contrivance could be introduced in courts of law! For six weary days has the Court of Exchequer been solemnly presiding over the efforts of a dozen of the first intellects in the country engaged with all their might in raising wind and blowing chaff about. At the end we have got the question reduced to a very simple state; but with what labour and pains, at what expenditure of time and learning, has it been cleared from the slight coating of doubt and difficulty which was all that at first enveloped it! First, Sir Hugh Cairns picked off his bit of chaff, and blew it in the Attorney-General's face. Then the Attorney-General said that Sir Hugh had cunningly left on the thinnest part of the husk, and had only dirtied the grain, and then he rubbed it very hard, sending, as he did so, a blast of dust into Sir Hugh Cairns' eyes. Next, Mr. Mellish held up what he said was a real genuine kernel, and the Bench looked at it curiously, and said it really was like a clean grain of wheat. Then from both sides came a volley of blasts, including one tremendous puff from the Queen's Advocate. At last, after all the pother, we come back to the one simple question, What does the Act lay down? and as Mr. Baron Bramwell puts it, we are to substitute for all ingenuity the interpretation of an honest mind. An admirable issue, a most marketable sample of good grain; but surely it was capable of being got at without all this interminable argument, this illustration from the courts of law of every nation, this suggestion from the speeches of every orator of the last generation, this etymological inquiry, this commentary on the "Whole Duty of Man," interwoven in a free translation of "Grotius de Jure Pacis et Belli." For, after all, nothing is more clear to the ordinary mind, or more firmly established in legal principle, than that when a suit is brought on an English statute, the words of the statute are the final limit of the rights of both parties, and that in interpreting the words we are to give them their most plain and rational signification. And this is all that the Court has now got to do, after rejecting as useless and irrelevant ninety-nine in a hundred of the arguments with which it has been baited.

For if these arguments were really worth the paper on which they have been printed, how unfortunate would be our situation? If, before acting in obedience to the statutes which the Legislature passes and publishes for our guidance, it were necessary to read

all the speeches of their promoters and opponents, to turn up Alison for his views on the matter as a historical question, to inquire what was the previous state of the law and how far it has been subsequently modified, to discover the intention not only from what has been said but from what has not been said, to investigate the etymology of every word and trace the various forms it has borne and the different meanings it has been used in, down to the day in which the Legislature inserted it in a statute; and to go through all this process not merely as regards home authorities and domestic history, but introducing all the analogy deducible from the corresponding proceedings and decisions and dictionaries of foreign nations, how utterly hopeless would the transaction of every business become! Life would then be a series of successive *Alexandra* trials—we must all become lawyers, or else fee lawyers and listen to them, perhaps a worse matter. But happily the law is not so bad as the lawyers would make it. It has been laid down a hundred times in our Supreme Courts that speeches in Parliament are quite inadmissible as an element in construing Acts of Parliament; that even the opinion of Parliament as to what it meant to do, and, *a fortiori*, the opinions of contemporary writers, are of no authority in determining what it actually has done; that words are to be read in their most natural sense irrespective of etymology; and that foreign rules or interpretations are of use only when some matter of undetermined common law is in question, not when the discussion is on a British statute. Why then have we, in defiance of all those well-known rules, been treated to a six days' argument prolonged only by virtue of breaking them? We can only make answer that the stake was considerable, and the question at issue interesting to the public; that therefore the parties were willing to pay heavy fees to counsel, and counsel quite ready to fool them to the top of their bent, by making a "sensation" case for their own glorification. We are absolutely persuaded that there was not one of the counsel engaged but was fully aware that the bulk of his argument turned upon matters which had nothing whatsoever to do with the decision that would be come to. And the result of the whole effort has been exactly to bring matters back where they stood at the beginning, and to leave to the Court to say what is the sense which an "honest mind" would put upon half a dozen lines of enactment.

That our readers may see the whole root of the matter we will once again place before them the words of the statute in question:—

"If any person within any part of the United Kingdom, or in any part of his Majesty's dominions beyond the seas, shall, without the leave and licence of his Majesty for that purpose first had and obtained as aforesaid, equip, furnish, fit out, or arm, or attempt or endeavour to equip, furnish, fit out, or arm, or procure to be equipped, furnished, fitted out, or armed, or shall knowingly aid, assist, or be concerned in the equipping, furnishing, fitting out, or arming of any ship or vessel, with intent or in order that such ship or vessel shall be employed in the service of any foreign prince, state, or potentate, or of any foreign colony, province, or part of any province or people, or of any person or persons exercising or assuming to exercise any powers of government in or over any foreign state, colony, province, or part of any province or people, as a transport or store-ship, or with intent to cruise or commit hostilities against any prince, state, or potentate, or against the subjects or citizens of any prince, state, or potentate, or against the persons exercising or assuming to exercise the powers of government in any colony, province, or part of any province or country, or against the inhabitants of any foreign colony, province, or part of any province or country with whom his Majesty shall not then be at war: every such person so offending shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor; and every such ship or vessel, with the tackle, apparel, or furniture, together with all the materials, arms, ammunition, and stores which may belong to or be on board of any such ship or vessel, shall be forfeited."

These words are very anxious in their reiteration, and certainly might be expected by those who framed them to meet every possible case. And if, in addition to the words equip, furnish, fit out, and arm, they had contained the word to "build," it has been almost admitted that they would certainly have covered, without dispute, the case of the *Alexandra*; for, beyond a doubt, she was being built for the purpose and with the design prohibited by the statute. But then, as the word "build" does not occur in the statute, the question is whether she was being equipped, or attempted to be equipped for warlike purposes. Now, her ultimate destination for warlike purposes is also scarcely denied—she was being built of a strength and of materials which pointed clearly to that conclusion, and this was being done under contract for the Confederate Government. So, the point in the interpretation of the statute became narrowed to this: Does the construction of a vessel of such a nature fall under the fair sense of equipping, furnishing, or fitting out? And the accusation made by the Crown against the Lord Chief Baron's charge to the jury on this head was twofold. In the first place it is alleged that he led them to under-

stand that in law construction is different from equipping, furnishing, or fitting out. In the second place, he laid down that the equipment must be made within her Majesty's dominions. But this last proposition will almost certainly not be ultimately maintained, whatever the Court of Exchequer may say to it.

The general principles of justice and law do not allow a statute to be evaded by dividing the operations it prohibits into two parts. The House of Lords, in a case quoted by the Attorney-General, which came up by appeal from Scotland, but arose out of English transactions, held that when the export of arms from this country was prohibited, except in licensed ships, it was equally illegal to export them in a licensed ship with the design of afterwards transferring them in a foreign port to an unlicensed ship. So we may be sure that when the statute forbids the equipping of a vessel for war in her Majesty's dominions, that House will not sanction the preparing of a ship to receive equipment at Liverpool, with the design of actually equipping her when on the high seas. This is plain common sense as well as law, and the opposite proposition would be an obvious contempt of law and an encouragement of chicane. So the whole question in the view both of honesty and of law comes to no more than this, Was the *Alexandra* in process of preparation? was she either being equipped here, or was she being built here in such a way as to be suitable for, and with the intention that she should receive equipment elsewhere, of the character struck at by the Act? These are pre-eminently questions of common facts and evidence suitable for a jury to inquire into. If the Chief Baron muddled their brains with theories of a distinction between old ships and new ones, or between beginning and finishing equipment, then another jury must sit on the matter. But we wish devoutly that when a very simple question happens to be misunderstood at first by a judge, he could be corrected with less than six mortal days of talk. Or if talk must be done we wish it could be ground off by a modification of the mill or chaff-cutting machine—or done any how, so that it be not printed, and required to be read in order to find out that it has been all about nothing at all.

POLICE SPIES.

A SINGULAR case was brought before the Court of Queen's Bench on Tuesday, collaterally suggesting a point of much importance, we hope only to a very limited class of the community. Let us relate the facts. Everybody knows that a man named Dietrichstein lately committed, or is said to have committed, a fraud in obtaining a number of valuable securities, the property of Messrs. Borthwick & Co., stockbrokers, by means of cheques which were worthless and were dishonoured. On the same day that the cheques were presented Dietrichstein disappeared, and got away to the Continent, whither he was pursued by a detective named Moss, and captured at Pesth, in Hungary, by Moss and an Austrian officer. This appears to have been rather a piece of good fortune for him than otherwise, for on some plea or other the Austrian authorities refuse to give him up, and the Old Bailey hungers and thirsts after him in vain.

Now, a Mr. Wolff, described as a merchant in the City, who introduced Dietrichstein to the Messrs. Borthwick, swears that he first knew him at Brighton in May last, and on two occasions had dealings with him in shares. After the middle of July last he never spoke to him, or held communication with him, direct or indirect. But in August, seeing him entering the office of the Messrs. Borthwick, and having, as he says, learnt something that shook his faith in his Brighton acquaintance, he wrote to the Borthwicks warning them to beware of him. On the 29th of August, as we learn from the affidavit of one of the Borthwicks, Dietrichstein obtained 1 share from their firm to the tune of £9,000; and on the 15th of October—this and what immediately follows we take from Mr. Wolff's affidavit—Mr. Michael Abrahams, Dietrichstein's attorney, wrote to Wolff desiring to see him. They met, and Abrahams endeavoured—Abrahams in his affidavit denies this—to intimidate Wolff into paying £4,000, to aid the retirement of the dishonoured checks, by telling him that Mullens, solicitor to the Borthwicks, intended, as soon as Dietrichstein was brought over, to give Wolff into custody. Wolff protested that he would not give a shilling, and would have nothing to do with the affair. He swore that he was entirely guiltless of any breach of the laws of this country; set forth the annoyance he had received in being watched and followed from place to place by the detective police; and alleged his belief that a conspiracy existed amongst certain persons against him to extort money, and that Inspector Hamilton, Sergeant Webb, George Tilley, George Whitney, and others, had "conspired to annoy, harass, and oppress me, by illegal and un-

constitutional means, to induce me to commit a breach of the peace." On this affidavit a rule *nisi* for a criminal information against the parties named was recently obtained in the Court of Queen's Bench, and on Tuesday cause was shown, the case argued, and the rule discharged.

And now we come to the other side of the story, as we gather it from the affidavits against Mr. Wolff's application. In the early part of October, the Messrs. Borthwick obtained information that Dietrichstein had been arrested in Hungary, and would shortly be sent over for trial. About the same time they obtained information, so says Mr. Borthwick, "that one John Wolff, of No. 5, Christopher-street, Finsbury-square, in the county of Middlesex, had been concerned with the said Sigismund Dietrichstein and others in the fraudulent transactions aforesaid, and was criminally responsible therefor." They immediately applied to Inspector Hamilton urging him to use all means in his power to keep himself acquainted with Wolff's whereabouts, in order that they might be able to arrest him on the arrival in this country of Dietrichstein. Who gave them the information about Wolff does not appear. But Mr. Abrahams swears that he had been informed that Wolff had agreed to advance a sum of money to assist in retiring the dishonoured cheques, and that it was thus he was led to seek the interview we have mentioned. Acting upon the instructions of Messrs. Borthwick, Inspector Hamilton set to work. On the 25th of September he and Webb called at Wolff's house, and made an appointment with Mrs. Wolff, her husband not being at home, to see him the next morning. But the same evening they received a letter from Wolff saying he could not be at home in the morning, but would see them if they called upon the receipt of his letter. Webb, accordingly, went, and here is his account of the interview:—

"I returned to the said house of the said John Wolff, and there saw the said John Wolff, and in course of conversation I asked him if he knew anything of a man named Dietrichstein, who had committed a fraud on Mr. Borthwick, a stockbroker of Gresham-house, I having heard from the said Mr. Borthwick that the said Dietrichstein was introduced to him by the said John Wolff; that the said John Wolff replied as follows:—'I did not introduce Dietrichstein to Mr. Borthwick, but I will go anywhere with you to find him, so help me God! for I have got into a great deal of bother through Dietrichstein. I have only known him a very short time through meeting him outside the Stock Exchange. You know if Dietrichstein is in Frankfurt-on-Maine you cannot touch him, but if you will go with me, I will run him down and will pay my own expenses.' Before leaving the house of the said John Wolff, I asked when it would be convenient for him to go with me. He said, 'You come to-morrow evening and I will tell you.' I said, 'I would call at seven o'clock the next evening, and most likely Inspector Hamilton would come also, as I could not leave England without the consent of my superior officer.'"

On the following evening Webb, accompanied by Hamilton, went to the house and saw him again. He professed his willingness to go with Webb in search of Dietrichstein; could not start that evening, nor before the following Monday, the 28th. He promised to call on Hamilton at his office on Monday morning, and would then tell him when he could go; but—he should not go without his expenses. Hamilton waived this point, and said his expenses should be paid. But when Monday came, Wolff did not put in the promised appearance. In his place came a letter from Messrs. Speyers & Son, his attorneys, who presented their compliments to Mr. Henry Webb, and would feel obliged if he would call in the course of the morning. Webb went, and one of the firm told him they were instructed by Mr. Wolff to know from Webb what charge there was against him; and if he, Mr. Speyer, could serve Webb in the matter he would. Webb, all caution, as becomes a detective, replied that he could say nothing more than that his inquiries in Dietrichstein's case had led him to see Wolff, and that Wolff had volunteered to go with him and run Dietrichstein down, and pay his own expenses. To which Speyers answered, that Wolff must be drunk or mad to say such a thing; whereupon the astute Webb, thinking he was on the eve of a discovery, said quietly, "Why?" But Speyers, though his first remark seems rash, was well upon his guard, and replied that Webb could see through a deal board quite as well as he could—one of those happy answers which are pregnant with suggestion and barren in result. Then Mr. Speyers added, that if Webb wanted any further communication with Wolff, it must be made through him; and that Wolff would not go with him to run Dietrichstein down. On the 4th of October, Hamilton swears he first obtained further information that Wolff was implicated with Dietrichstein in the alleged frauds; that Dietrichstein had been arrested at Pesth, and would shortly be sent to this country for trial, but that it would not be expedient to arrest Wolff till Dietrichstein had arrived. Acting on that information—which, he says, it would defeat the ends of justice to disclose—he, on the 4th of October, ordered

George Tilley and George Whitney to watch the person and residence of Wolff daily from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m.; to follow him at a distance whenever he left his residence, and generally to keep an eye on all his movements. On the 24th of October Wolff went abroad, first giving notice to the police of his intention to do so. He complains that police officers were sent after him to Frankfort, but this is denied. He complains, moreover, that Whitney and Tilley, while they had him under surveillance, were guilty of insolence and misconduct. This also is denied. And there is the whole story.

Clearly in the affidavits produced there is no proof of conspiracy; and the Court refused to make the rule absolute for a criminal information. But how about this system of police *espionage*? The Lord Chief Justice said he would be very sorry to lay down any rule that the police might not watch persons under suspicion of crime. But who is to determine what amount of suspicion warrants a proceeding in itself detestable, and only tolerable in very extreme cases? In the present, the course of procedure seems to have been this:—Messrs. Borthwick obtained information, which led them to believe that Mr. Wolff had some hand in Dietrichstein's frauds. They put themselves in communication with their solicitors, the Messrs. Mullens. The Messrs. Mullens put themselves in communication with Inspector Hamilton; and Hamilton, instructed by them, placed Wolff under the surveillance of Tilley and Whitney. For twenty days these two constables dogged him wherever he went. What a life he must have led during that time! Many a man would sooner be arrested and thrown into prison at once. But is it not monstrous that the power to inflict such torture should be in the hands of an inspector of police—an absolute power to mark a man out in the eyes of the world as a felon; to say nothing of the personal torment he must have endured, feeling that he could not leave his house, or go into it, or look out of his parlour window, or sit by his fire-side, or visit a friend, or go about his business, without having the shadow of two constables for ever upon him; knowing that he was daily becoming infamous in the eyes of his neighbours, and noted by all who were acquainted with his person as one walking about with the hand of the law ever close to him, ready to collar him and drag him to the Old Bailey. And who is to be the judge of the circumstances which denied a suspected man the right of being at once accused, and allowed an opportunity of defending his innocence? Surely not an inspector of police. If the law entrusts a power so terrible to such hands, it is a most abominable law. And observe how this system of surveillance is spreading. The law sets the example. Detectives of twenty years' experience, keen-scented, vigilant, well up to their trade, set up private inquiry offices. The system is spreading, operating far beyond the circle of its immediate action; and tending, wherever it takes root, to destroy that manly openness of conduct which is the boast of our race.

AN UNHAPPY WIFE.

THE story of Mrs. Hunt and her two children, who died of a poisoned draught from the hand of their own husband and father, is now complete. We may read the letters of that unhappy wife, complaining to her sister of a long course of domestic cruelty. Nothing, indeed, can enhance the feelings of compassion and horror that such a fate as hers was calculated to excite. Yet when these cries of distress from the wretched household at Camberwell are published across her open grave—having until her death been confined to one sympathizing ear—we are still more vividly impressed with a sense of her previous sufferings. There are some signs, however, that she may have intended these letters—or, at least, those of a recent date,—to serve for evidence and publication, in the event of anything happening to force an exposure of her case. She certainly wrote the latest of them with a view to the probable speedy termination of her bondage, either by a divorce or by her untimely death; for her sister, Miss Harriet Blake was frequently desired to keep them, and they were signed, in a very unusual style, with her marriage title of "Mrs. Hunt." Nevertheless, their language is of a touching simplicity—it seems to be the language of truth. They are just such letters as a broken-hearted and despairing woman might send to one whom she regarded as her only friend upon earth. "So unhappy! Do come. Only you to say a word to." This is the pitiful burthen of them all.

The first of them was written in January of this year, and the last was in October, a week or so before that fatal ride through London streets in which Death rode along with her and carried her far away from the scene of mortal sorrows. The person who had wrought her so much pain—and who, by a most heinous crime, at last put an end to her misery—is continually spoken of, but she only

once calls him "my husband," and once she names him "William." Elsewhere throughout this correspondence he appears as a dreadful "He," by whose tyrannical presence and unrelenting persecutions she is slowly crushed. Yet she does not revile him, but wails sadly for deliverance, and wonders that she can still live under the burden of such a grief. "I have lived upon hope for some time," she says, "and that has nearly died out; but I don't know who will be first—hope or myself." What sort of a hope was this? There may once have been some hope of kinder treatment from her husband, but that seems to have died out before the earliest date of these letters; then came the hope of her obtaining a separation, and that died also; lastly, she conceived the hope of death, in which—it may be well for her—she has not been disappointed. We can trace these changes in her mind from the time when there was some talk about "a paper she was to agree to," and whether he would "allow her any money to keep her with," until she became not only persuaded of his intention to kill her, but, as it appears, even resigned to die.

We know not, indeed, the day or the hour when he really began to plot this murder. But it seems that, with a singular refinement of malignity, he had for many months past studiously practised upon her mind to keep her under the terror of death. It will be remembered that he was accustomed to divert himself with chemical experiments in a laboratory which, though he had nothing to do with it in his lawful employment, he chose to set up at home. We may perceive how he sometimes used his scientific knowledge to overawe the imagination of this poor ignorant woman, by hinting that he possessed many strange and secret means of destruction which left her life at his mercy. So long ago as last January, indeed, he told her that "if he chose to kill her, he could do it in such a manner that he would not be found out;" adding, with a grotesque exaggeration, that "he could melt her to nothing, all but her hair." And there can be no doubt, from these letters, that she lived henceforth in continual dread. She literally walked through the valley of the shadow of death. As the housewife, she may have relied upon her own continual vigilance to prevent him from mixing poison with her daily food. But among the first of those letters which her sister is particularly requested to take care of, is one describing the symptoms of a disease that suddenly and unaccountably attacked her, when she woke up at night with a strange pain and difficulty of breathing, which he affected to treat lightly, telling her "it would be all right soon." This was in August,—long before the incident which she related to her sister (as stated by Harriet Blake at the inquest) of an attempt which Hunt made to force the contents of a small bottle down her throat by opening her mouth while she lay in bed asleep.

Let us remark, by the way, that the coroner, Dr. Lankester, if he had been a lawyer instead of a medical man, would have been better advised than to refuse to admit these letters in evidence. It is a rule of all our courts that the text of such documents, wherever it can be produced, should be taken in preference to any verbal account of their purport.

The fact, however, is tolerably certain that Hunt did, one night about the beginning of October, try to murder her *by poison in her sleep*. The poet has imagined Hamlet's father to have been so murdered. It is the murder of "innocent sleep," which the universal instinct of mankind detests, above all other modes of "murder most foul, as in the best it is." It seems that the destined victim on this occasion, after awaking and struggling successfully to put back the deadly potion that was thrust upon her, rushed to the window and screamed for help. None came to help her, and who shall conceive the horrors which she must have endured throughout the rest of that hideous night, shut up in the dark chamber with her intending murderer, and listening, perhaps, to a repetition of his wonted threats? It may be thought wonderful that she should yet continue to live with him, to share his meals, to sleep in his bed, or, at least, under his roof, until a month or five weeks later, the 7th November, when she was deluded, by the proposal of a journey, to accompany him, with her children, in a cab ordered to go to the railway station, and on that very evening drank the poisoned cup. The truth seems to be, that her spirit was completely subdued by this protracted experience of sorrow, and that she consciously awaited her fate; though she never contemplated suicide, she was not averse to the death which she foresaw. As we have already remarked, there are in her letters, after a certain period, some indications of this, her latest and most desponding mood. She seems to have been gradually fascinated by his undisguised determination to destroy her. In January, when he boasted of his mysterious power to kill, she may not have believed that he seriously meant to do the deed; she comments

upon it only as "a dreadful wish." And she begs her relations—John, Ann, and Harriet—not to come to the house, because her husband only asks them in order that he may insult her by showing them how ill she is treated. In February she complains that he has "beaten her head with both hands like a ball," and that she is forbidden to eat, drink, or sleep with him. Probably, she would not have been apprehensive of poison at that time. In March she says that he has knocked her down and kicked her, thrown a dish at her, cut her shoulder open, given her "a second black eye within ten days," and bruised her from head to foot. Other grievances, which any wife would have a right to resent, but which do not threaten her existence, are also referred to. Her husband comes and tells her that he has paid a guinea for two seats in which "he and his woman" had got accommodation to see the entry of the Princess Alexandra, and that he afterwards went to the Lyceum with this paramour—of whom, as we remember, the sister also spoke at the inquest. All these things are bad to bear; yet not worse than many a woman, if she be mated with a brutal profligate, has to bear, so long as, for the sake of her children, or to avoid a public exposure, and perhaps destitution, she refrains from applying for legal redress. Up to this time Mrs. Hunt does not seem to have been so completely cowed and subdued by the threat of death hanging over her, as she became at a later period.

There is here a blank in the correspondence. In June, the miserable wife, bruised, as she says, with the blows from her sworn protector until she can hardly move, has resolved to obtain a separation. "I don't think it will be many days before me and William part, and will you come and see me before we do?" It is probable that Hunt, who may have feared to lose his situation, if his ill-usage of his family had become a public scandal, induced her, by promises of better conduct, to give up the idea of a divorce. The sister tells us that, whenever Hunt and his wife made up their quarrels, he was always very affectionate afterwards; and he used, upon such occasions, to send for drink, of which they would all partake; though Mrs. Hunt was never in the habit of drinking to excess. At any rate, we find that, towards the end of July, they were on such terms that she was desirous to please his taste in her dress. She was vexed when he met her in the Westminster Road, that he did not like the bonnet she wore,—a bonnet she had just made for herself. He walked away from her, though both were going home; he scolded her all tea-time, and perhaps her woman's tongue was likewise busy, till, in a rage, he thrust at her with his knife, and said he would kill her; then he threw a chair at her, and this caused a bruise to which, in their future quarrels, she would point or look, as a silent reproach for his violence. But she now begins to ask that her letters may be preserved. She has a notion that, if she can prove it to be dangerous for her to stay with him, a separation may be procured, and he may be obliged to maintain her. Of the children—who were not, at this time, generally ill-treated by their father—she does not say one word; and hence it may be concluded, although she was not a bad mother, that she would have left them under his care. She must have spoken to him, in July, of her intention to go to the Divorce Court, but he deterred her from doing so, by an intimation that he would kill her if she did. "He threatens me if I say I will do anything; so I don't know what to do." "He says there is not any law for me; I need not expect that." "He dared me to take any proceedings against him." But she seems to have been especially impressed with the dark significance of his reply upon one occasion, when she said they had better separate, and he answered, "Yes, we can have that, but not out of the house." She did not understand him to mean by this sentence, that they should go on living in the same house, but not as husband and wife. What she understood was, that he meant to get rid of her, but in such a manner that she should not live apart from him. That this was in her mind appears, we think, from the words immediately following, "Mind, I tell you this; I don't think my life is safe with him, and I have thought so for some time." From this period, August 29th, she grows evidently more and more accustomed to the idea of dying under his hands,—or, as the probable alternative, that other idea, so familiar to weak persons, dying of grief. "I don't think there is any more happy days for me in store." Her hope of deliverance is dying; she wonders whether hope or she will die first. "I say, 'Good-bye,' with an aching heart, and it won't be changed until there is a change in some way." In September, there is again some talk of a formal separation; and she asks sister Harriet to ask brother John his opinion about some "paper" that she is to agree to; and whether her husband can refuse, as he says, to allow her any money to live upon. Yet we are disposed to think she had already lost all faith in the possibility of a release. Her tyrant and tormentor, who did

not choose to let her go even with her bare life from that ruined home which he had made a prison and a hell, exerted his fiendish arts to keep her imagination on the rack with incessant fears of some vague form of certain destruction that should pursue her night and day, until it pleased him to destroy. We have seen the effect it had upon her, when he told her that there should be a separation, but this without letting her go out of the house. It is terrible to fancy the expression of face and the tone of voice by which these few words could be made to convey to her mind the suggestion of a murderous intent. In her next letter she is more than ever frightened by his manner, and she thinks he is mad. "He has killed all the birds this morning," she says; but we know not whether this was done in his experiments with prussic acid, or whether it was on purpose to frighten her; or was it part of a scheme to provide evidence for his acquittal on the ground of insanity, in the event of his being ultimately tried for the murder which he had already planned? This we do not guess; but throughout August, September, and October he continued to threaten her life. "I feel quite unsafe with him," is her repeated observation just now. "He said, if I died, he should send me to the surgeon, and not bury me; there's dreadful talk." Again, she says, "Dear Harriet, if you do not come to me I do not think you will ever see me again." "I wish I was good enough to die," moans the poor soul; "but I must try and make myself good, as what he wants, he says, is to see me dead; then he would laugh, and think what a good thing to think I am gone from this world. What will become of me? I speak the truth when I say I shall die with a broken heart." It was only a week or so before her tragical end that she wrote to her sister—"Dear Harriet, never let it surprise you when you hear I am dead."

We could almost think it possible that she knowingly and willingly drank the poison at last, and allowed her little girls to drink it, as a way of escaping from her misery. Yet these letters show many traits of character from which we should judge that she was an honest and gentle sort of woman, with her due share of kindly affections. After all, we can only say of her, or of any human being, just what she says of herself, "I have plenty of faults, I know, but God knows what I am."

LORD CLARENCE PAGET ON NAVAL GUNNERY.

On the occasion of the inaugural dinner of the Mayor of Deal, the Secretary to the Admiralty must have been somewhat taken by surprise when he found himself called upon to respond to the toast of "Her Majesty's Ministers;" and upon the principle that the least said is the soonest mended, we find the gallant Secretary making very short work of the Ministerial claims to the gratitude and admiration of the people of Deal. Lord Clarence Paget evidently found himself suddenly called upon to rush in where his chief had feared to tread, and, with the characteristic pluck of the British sailor, he undertook the duty which had been assigned to him. He would probably have found it difficult to prove some assertions which he, on the spur of the moment, hazarded for the delectation of his hearers, and, with every desire to preserve the harmony of the meeting, there could hardly fail to be "difference of opinion." On commercial subjects the noble lord was out of his element, and we do not hold him responsible for the sentiments to which he gave utterance at the festive board; but in naval matters we may consider Lord Clarence Paget as the veritable Sir Oracle; and as his lordship was evidently at Deal for the express purpose of speaking on naval matters, we would desire to draw attention to one branch of naval efficiency which hardly receives from the press the consideration which the importance of the subject deserves. We refer to the subject of naval gunnery.

The Secretary to the Admiralty did not venture to monopolize for the present Government the whole of the merit of the reconstruction of the navy, but he evidently wished to receive for his party the lion's share of the credit which unquestionably belongs to the Admiralty for their great and successful efforts for the development of our naval power, especially "when we remember in how short a time" our great standing navy has been created. As the first speech of Lord Clarence was in reply to the toast of "Her Majesty's Ministers," the we can only have reference to the Board of Admiralty of the present Government.

While re-assuring us on the subject of our iron-clad fleet, in which the public confidence was rather shaken by the performances of the *Prince Consort*, we do not get a very satisfactory account of the practice of the art of gunnery on board the ships of the British fleet. We may presume that the war-ships of any maritime power may be considered as so many floating batteries whereon we are to

carry beyond the seas the cannon which we believe to be the *ultima ratio regum*, or, in other words, that it is the guns which are expected to do the work by the assistance of the ships. One of our departments has long since been turning its attention to the efficiency of our ships, both in the matter of the carrying of our own guns and also in the power of resisting the effects of the guns of an enemy. But the ships without efficient guns would be in much the same predicament as the dismounted dragoon—like a goose on a turnpike-road. Our War Department has, therefore, set for itself the problem of producing an efficient gun, but we fear that the naval authorities are rather apt to forget the question of guns in the more congenial question of ships. We are aware that the attention of scientific and practical men—and some of them are naval men—has been given to the production of an efficient gun, but we see no signs of the navy having given us efficient gunners. On the occasion of the Deal banquet, the Secretary to the Admiralty was obliged to defend his brethren from “the most grievous charge which could be brought against them, that of inhumanity,” at the expense of their character for efficiency as gunners. Having been twitted by a portion of the press for gross cruelty in bombarding the defenceless town of Kagosima, and for the consequent destruction by the British squadron of the property and even of the lives of the unoffending inhabitants, while they failed to inflict due chastisement on the insolent Daimio, the only defence which could be made to this charge was, either that the bombardment, being deliberate and premeditated, was to be justified; or that it was not premeditated but purely accidental, and, although much to be deplored, could not under the circumstances be avoided. Finding himself on the horns of a dilemma, the gallant Admiral preferred to give the following explanation:—

“It has been assumed that Admiral Kuper and the gallant sailors under him wilfully bombarded a defenceless town, and destroyed the property of its innocent inhabitants. Now, it becomes me, as a brother officer of these gallant men, and likewise as the officer who may be said to represent them in this country, or, at all events, in the House of Commons, to explain to you that the loss of property, through the dreadful conflagration which occurred on that occasion, was not due to any intention of the Admiral or the officers and sailors of the fleet, whose only object was to punish the insolent Daimio who had been guilty of the murder of an Englishman. The action was precipitated by the forts of the Daimio commencing to open fire on the British ships. It so happened that it blew a very heavy gale of wind at the time, and my brother sailors around me will easily understand that in the midst of a furious storm, with a heavy sea running, and on a lee shore, it was a very arduous enterprise that this small squadron, with its handful of men, had to perform. (Hear, hear.) Well, they performed their duty nobly; and I am sure that if it had not been for the dreadful sea running, and the consequent unsteadiness of the platforms of the guns, the fire of our ships would have been confined to the forts which belonged to the Prince, and would not have extended to the town which lay in their rear. (Hear, hear.) I am certain that any damage then unfortunately done to the property or the lives of the innocent townspeople is deplored as much by the Admiral commanding that squadron, and every officer and man in it, as by the Government or the public of this country. (Hear, hear.) I have thought it only due to those gallant men to endeavour to vindicate their honour from a charge which to us sailors is one of the most grievous that can be brought against us—namely, that of inhumanity (hear, hear); because I may say both of the army and navy of this country that if there is any marked characteristic of Englishmen it is their humanity in warfare.”

The plain English of this is that, although we engaged the batteries at a range of 400 yards, we made such very bad practice that, while we failed to silence the batteries which continued to engage us as we left the bay, we really could not help throwing our shot and shell among the inhabitants in rear of the batteries, and in doing so we unfortunately destroyed the town of Kagosima by setting it on fire. It was very dreadful, but we could not be responsible for the flight of our projectiles after we had once rammed them home in the chamber of the guns.

All this, it must be remembered, occurred at the somewhat close range of 400 yards. It may be urged that the engagement took place in a gale of wind. This certainly was the case, but was this absolutely necessary? A perusal of the evidence of naval officers who appeared before the Committee on Ordnance, will show that in their opinion the great difficulty to contend with in the service of guns on board ship is the unsteadiness of the platform. This is the chief objection to the employment of rifled guns on board ship, as the admitted accuracy of the gun is thrown away by reason of the unsteadiness of the platform. If this, then, be the normal condition of gun practice on board ship, why increase the chance of error due to this particular cause by selecting a moment for engaging an enemy when the ships of the squadron “are carried up to the heaven and down again to the deep,” and “reel to and fro and stagger like a drunken man?” If, under the most favourable circumstances, a ship's guns are at a disadvantage on account

of the unsteadiness of their platforms, why gratuitously increase the disadvantages on this score? By engaging at such close quarters, we placed the barbarian enemy on an equality with ourselves, with the additional advantage to the Japanese of a steady platform. They profited well by our rashness, and with a painful conviction of the inefficiency of his own fire, Admiral Kuper was obliged to give the enemy credit for being good gunners, because they hit their targets, while *we* failed to do so. Had the squadron waited for the smooth water of the following day, and engaged at a longer range, we might have levelled the batteries, and have sailed out of Kagosima Bay with all honours. The only way in which we can account for the course pursued by Admiral Kuper is in the supposition that that officer felt himself bound in honour not to refuse the challenge of Satsuma; and although, from his knowledge of the difficulties attending practice on board ship, he could hardly hope to dismantle the batteries in a gale of wind, yet his powder and shot would not be entirely thrown away, as they must of necessity fall into the town in rear of the batteries. It was, therefore, only necessary to load and blaze away as long as any ammunition remained in the magazines. In the heavy losses we sustained, we paid dearly for the character which we have gained for pluck in fighting our guns during a heavy gale, and for cruelty in bombarding an inoffensive town. The motto of a distinguished cavalry regiment, “*Memor pristinae virtutis*,” has too much weight with our naval officers to be in accordance with the science of war as developed in the present day. As their fathers did before them, so will they do at the present day. “Our predecessors closed with the enemy, and so should we. They did not condescend to play at long bowls, and we shall not degenerate. Who's afraid?” This is the pardonable argument of the navy of the present day, but they never ask themselves why their fathers closed with the enemy. The principal reason—and a very good one, too—was that they could do no damage unless they did close. The guns of former days had little pretensions to accuracy, and were badly equipped, and “naval gunnery” was unknown. This lesson was rather roughly taught us by the Americans, who, by attention to guns and gunnery, obliged us to engage at long ranges, and before our ships could close they were generally dismantled and at the mercy of the enemy. So will it be again. The ship that can with impunity first open fire will be able to deliver so many more shot and shell and do so much the greater damage, than can be achieved by the less discreet opponent who wishes to reserve his fire for a close action. This is a lesson which our navy will have to learn over again if they despise the implements with which they are provided and are content to blaze away all their ammunition at point-blank range—an achievement which can be arrived at by any barbarians provided with guns, for there is nothing to be done but to put in a shot (the navy prefer two shots) and fire it out again. Why are our Shoeburyness experiments always carried on at 200 yards' range, except to give an apparent preponderance to the efficacy of the fire of smooth-bored guns, which are good at that range? It is within the point-blank range, and the wish to engage at that range is father to the thought that it is the only effective range for ships' batteries. The use of rifled guns requires care and coolness, and these are qualities in which sailors are generally deficient. They prefer the excitement of a heavy engagement at close quarters with double-shotted guns. Had they at Kagosima condescended to wait for more favourable weather, and then taken a little trouble with their Armstrong guns at a range beyond the powers of their enemy, we should not have had to deplore the loss of two superior officers by a single shot; while we could have repeated the Bexhill experiments at the expense of the Prince of Satsuma, and have deliberately dismantled every gun in the batteries which were so efficiently served by the Japanese. The navy should remember that in cases where they can select their own ranges, as in action with land batteries, the old proverb will still hold good, and discretion will prove to be the better part of valour.

THE COURT-MARTIAL UPON LIEUTENANT-COLONEL CRAWLEY.

WE continue our report from the point at which we left off last week. On the reassembling of the Court, Colonel Crawley elicited from Major Champion that he was in constant communication with Colonel Crawley during the time of the arrest of the three sergeants, and never remarked any malicious or vindictive spirit on his part towards Lilley or the other sergeants. On their release, General Farrell made an address to Sergeant Wakefield, in the presence of the officers and non-commissioned officers of the 6th Dragoons, upon the 7th of June, in which he deplored that the sudden death of Lilley had deprived him of the consolation of being pardoned in their presence, and admonished all present

that subordination was the golden rule for all soldiers serving her Majesty. When the address was made, Sergeant Wakefield appeared to be in perfect health, and did not resemble "a raving maniac." The adjutant of the regiment took the address to the hospital where it was read to Sergeant Duval.

In reference to his statement of the previous day, that Lilley's late quarters were now inhabited by Sergeant-Major Dibble, Major Champion added that in addition to those quarters, Dibble had another room on the north side of similar dimensions to that in which Lilley lived.

Asked by the Court as to his definition of "close arrest," the witness said that it meant that a sentry must be over the quarters in which the prisoner lives, and that it is a mode of arrest resorted to when serious crimes are charged against the prisoner. In the Bombay Presidency there are no orders on the mode of carrying out close arrest. It is discretionary, and depends on the nature of the prisoner's quarters. Could not say what definition General Farrell would give of "close arrest;" but in Lilley's case it was necessary to prevent his having communication with outside parties. To the best of his belief, General Farrell was not aware of the placing of a sentry in the same room with Lilley and his wife. General Farrell ordered, in addition to Lilley's being kept in close arrest, that no one should have access to him except by Colonel Crawley's express permission.

Lieutenant and Adjutant J. G. Fitzsimon was then called into court, and cross-examined by Colonel Crawley.

Witness said that the first quarters in which Lilley was confined were comfortable; the second not, especially for a married man. They were "about the same" as the quarters now occupied by the married men of the regiment. From what he recollected, the second quarters were a bomb-proof building, though he did not particularly notice whether they were so or not. It would not be a true description to say that they were "a bomb-proof oven." They were fit for habitation, but not comfortable; and would be injurious to health in such very hot weather. The greater part of the families of the regiment were occupying similar quarters while witness was adjutant. There were continuous complaints made about them to him, both by men and women of the regiment. The quarters were furnished by Government for the use of the regiment. It was not Colonel Crawley's fault that they were unhealthy. Had read in the papers the misrepresentations about the quarters; did not recollect having heard of them elsewhere, and had no knowledge in what quarters such misrepresentations originated. Never took any steps to correct an impression so injurious to the honour of his commanding officer.

Since witness's return to England Mr. Smales had called upon him twice or thrice at his hotel. Witness had met him once by accident in the streets, and once at Aldershot at the Court-martial. They had conversed upon the subject of the trial. Witness had been suspended from his adjutancy of the 6th Dragoons in consequence of his commanding officer having reported him, he believed because he had partaken of the paymaster's hospitality, and also on the ground that he was not competent to perform the duties of adjutant. Had partaken of the paymaster's hospitality while Mr. Smales was under arrest at Mhow:—

"Was it while the Court-martial on Mr. Smales was actually in progress?—I think so.

"Was Mr. Smales tried for insubordinate conduct to me, as commanding officer of the regiment?—Yes.

"Do you regard the adjutant of a regiment as the confidential and right-hand man of his commanding officer?—Decidedly.

"Do you think it consistent with the duty of a person in such a position to be on terms of intimacy with a person standing in such a relation to me as Mr. Smales then did?—I consider that having known Captain Smales and his family for a long course of years, ever since they came to the regiment, and having always been on terms of intimacy with them, I was not wrong in partaking of their hospitality."

Witness's removal from the adjutancy was confirmed and approved by Sir W. Mansfield. Shown a letter; could not say whether it was the one from Sir W. Mansfield in which his resignation was approved. Believed it to be the same in substance as a copy which he had at home. Imagined it must be the original, from the signature, to which his attention was now called. Did not remember ever having seen it before.

[In this letter Lieutenant Fitzsimon's conduct in visiting Paymaster Smales was censured as, "to use the mildest terms," a matter of "great indiscretion."]

The witness was next examined with reference to his share in the Mhow Court-martial. Asked whether he was censured by the Court-martial for the evasive character of his evidence on that occasion; said he was censured by the Commander-in-Chief. Did not recollect whether he was censured by the Court. Pressed as to whether the Court-martial at Mhow reflected on the evasive and unsatisfactory character of his replies, answered: "I really cannot at present recollect what the remarks of the Court were, or whether they were made on me or not. I have never read their proceedings through. I read chiefly my own evidence in the Court-martial Book." The Commander-in-Chief, after perusing witness's evidence before the Court-martial, pronounced it evasive and unsatisfactory, and such as showed witness's entire unfitness for the adjutancy of the regiment.

The cross-examination now turned upon the written order of the 26th of April, given by Colonel Crawley for the arrest of the three sergeants.

Witness could not really say whether any one was present when Colonel Crawley gave him that order. Asked why, when he was able to state who were present when the second order was given [the order alleged by the witness to have been given him by Colonel Crawley to post the sentries inside the sergeants' quarters], he was unable to state who were present when the first order was given; he replied, "It was with reference to the second occasion that the Commander-in-Chief, Sir Hugh Rose, remarked on the manner in which the sentries were posted; and as I intended at the time to write a letter of explanation for the information of the Commander-in-Chief, I naturally inquired from several officers whether they were present or not on the occasion to which allusion was made, in order to discover whether they remembered the order I received from my commanding officer." His statement as to who were present on the second occasion did not depend on the information he received from others; but he believed them to have been present, and inquired whether they recollected the order he had received. Should not have liked to depose to the fact without previously asking them, as they might have been out of the room when the order was given. The remark of Sir Hugh Rose, to which he alluded, stated that "to the carelessness and neglect of his duty as adjutant must be attributed the annoyance caused by posting the sentry in the quarters occupied by Sergeant-Major Lilley, when that officer was directed by Major-General Farrell to be placed in close arrest." That must have referred to the second order, as no inconvenience was caused by the manner in which the sentry was posted according to the first. Pressed as to whether the first order he received "was calculated to cause annoyance to Sergeant-Major Lilley," witness replied, "I cannot understand the meaning of that question, whether it is intended that the commanding officer meant to annoy Sergeant-Major Lilley. If the meaning of the words 'calculated to annoy' be whether the commanding officer wished thereby to annoy the sergeant-major, I cannot answer the question. I do not know." Could not say whether it was the intention of Colonel Crawley to annoy Lilley by the first order. "The commanding officer [Colonel Crawley] was very much enraged with him [Lilley]." Could not say whether the order for arresting Lilley caused him annoyance—doubtless it did. The posting of the sentries inside did, certainly. The posting of the sentry outside could not have inconvenienced him. Was told by Colonel Crawley, at the time of putting the sergeants in arrest, that he had reason to believe they were in a conspiracy against him. Did not know, but heard subsequently, with what object they were placed under arrest. Did not consider it his duty as adjutant to see the sentries posted himself. Inspected them after they were posted. Considered it the duty of an adjutant to see where the sentry is placed, and whether he is acquainted with his orders after he has been posted. Gave the order for the arrest to the acting regimental sergeant-major, who copied it in his presence. The copy was exact. The order directed the sentries to be placed "over" the quarters of each prison. Understood from the order that they were to be placed "outside." Did not recollect asking Colonel Crawley, when he first gave the order, whether the sentry was to be placed inside or outside the quarters. Could not undertake to say that he did not ask the question, and that Colonel Crawley told him that the sentries were to be posted outside. Could only say he did not recollect it. Had not the slightest recollection at what o'clock that evening [April 26] he first visited the sentry. Believed that he visited him as soon as he was unoccupied with official business. Did not recollect whether he was occupied at mess after the sentries were posted, or whether he went to mess that night, though he thought he did not. If he did, should think he visited the sentries first. Could not state the time at which the order for the arrest was taken by Sergeant-Major Cotton. Believed it was before dark.

"How does it happen that your memory is much less retentive as to these matters than as to those which you have spoken of in such detail in your examination in chief?—The matters I spoke of in more detail in my examination in chief were matters which I had written down in the letter I wanted to forward to the Commander-in-Chief, and which I have spoken of frequently. I therefore bore them in mind better. That is the only reason I can give for it.

"How long a period had elapsed between these events and the date of your letter to the Commander-in-Chief?—What events?

"The events occurring on the 26th of April?—About six months.

"Had you spoken frequently about these matters before your letter to the Commander-in-Chief; and, if so, to whom?—I think I had spoken frequently about them to several officers in the regiment. I spoke to numbers of officers in the regiment about it before my letter to the Commander-in-Chief."

Witness was next examined as to the position of the sentry, and said that, to the best of his recollection, when witness visited him, he was standing in the verandah in front of the house. He added that, to the best of his recollection, the sentry was also ordered to come round frequently to the back door. He could not say who gave that order; but as the sentry was not to allow any person to hold communication with Lilley, it would be necessary that he should occasionally walk round to the rear of the house. It would be discretionary on the part of the sentry to do so, in order fully to carry out the order for close arrest.

The cross-examination then turned upon an order which directed that Lilley should be allowed exercise.

Witness stated that, to the best of his recollection, this order was given a short time after Lilley's arrest. Could not state the time without looking at the order. Thought that Colonel Crawley gave the order as soon as it was brought to his knowledge that

Lilley required exercise. Did not recollect making any request in Lilley's favour which was refused; and did not recollect making any request at all.

Examined as to the date of the conversation alleged to have taken place in the orderly room in the barracks [when Colonel Crawley, as the witness stated, asked him if he knew what close arrest meant, and ordered the sentry to be posted inside Lilley's quarters]. Witness adhered to his statement on the examination in chief, that Sergeant-Major Cotton made the remark, with reference to posting the sentry inside, that Lilley was a married man, and said that Colonel Crawley got into a great rage with him for making the remark, and "I think" ordered him to leave the room for doing so. Asked why he did not cause the second order (for posting the sentry inside) to be entered in the regimental order-book; witness said it was because he had received no order from Colonel Crawley to that effect. The second order was immediately acted upon, as Colonel Crawley told the acting regimental sergeant-major to go and see about it immediately. When witness visited the sentry he was posted inside, with orders to follow him from one room to the other, but not to the water-closet—the only exemption in the order. Did not recollect that the sentries complained that they were unable to do their duty outside the building. Did not make any attempt to put the sentries inside, so as to observe the prisoner without unnecessarily inconveniencing him. Posted them so as not to lose sight of the prisoner. There were four or five rooms, and the sentries had to follow Lilley from one to the other. Did not himself go into the house, as he knew that Mrs. Lilley was sick, and he did not wish to inconvenience her. Was not aware who was the first sentry who saw Sergeant Lilley rub the liniment on Mrs. Lilley's chest. Mentioned the fact to Colonel Crawley as he heard it. Did not know that Mrs. Lilley suffered this inconvenience; had only heard it. Did not know whether Mrs. Lilley was compelled to perform all the functions of nature in the presence of the sentries. Did not recollect having inquired. Could not state whether the sentries were posted inside Mrs. Lilley's bedroom. Had heard it said that they were. Did not make any report to Colonel Crawley of Lilley or his wife having suffered annoyance from the sentries. Had not received such a report from Lilley or his wife, but had heard it spoken of. Did not think that Mrs. Lilley was continually confined to her bed. Had never seen her out of the house. Had been told she was unwell, and therefore did not enter the house. It was his belief that she was always in the house. Did not inquire whether she was or not. If she was up, he did not think it would have annoyed her had he entered in order to select a proper post for the sentries; but he did not inquire whether she was up and about the house or not. Could swear that he did not know that she was never confined to her bed, but went about the barracks and visited her acquaintance. Considered that Sergeant-Major Lilley, living with his wife, must have suffered inconvenience by having the sentry posted so that he was not to lose sight of him day or night. Asked if he intended to convey the impression that, while Colonel Crawley was careful to protect Sergeant Lilley's privacy in going to the water-closet, he intended Mrs. Lilley's to be intruded upon; answered, that he could not say what Colonel Crawley intended. Abstained from entering the second bungalow out of regard to Mrs. Lilley's health. Believed that Cornet Snell acted for witness as adjutant when he was placed on the sick-roll. Did not recollect whether that appointment was made at his request, on the ground that Snell was living in the same house with witness, and that the orderly-room was in that house at the time.

Examined with respect to his letter of the 3rd November, 1862, written for the information of the Commander-in-Chief, and in which he represented that the posting the sentinels inside Lilley's quarters was in pursuance of Colonel Crawley's order and not his, witness explained that the reason why he allowed so long a time to elapse—from July, when Colonel Crawley made his address before the Mhow Court Martial attributing the order to witness, to November when witness wrote his letter—was that he had been absent on leave, and was not aware of Colonel Crawley's statement till his return.

Colonel Crawley's letter to the Commander-in-Chief replying to the witness's letter was then read. It unequivocally denied the witness's statement.

The cross-examination of Lieutenant Fitzsimon occupied three days.

Sergeant E. Mills was recalled and cross-examined by Colonel Crawley.

He stated, in effect, that according to the orders Private Blake had received he should have posted the sentry in the servants' room, from which the sentry could see Sergeant-Major Lilley, who slept on a couch in the large room of the bungalow. Mrs. Lilley slept in another room and could not have been inconvenienced by the sentries if they were posted according to the orders witness had received. No sentry, as far as witness knew, had seen Lilley rub the liniment on his wife's chest; he had never seen him do so. Orders were given to the sentries not to enter Mrs. Lilley's bedroom on any account.

[Behind Lilley's room, which extended the whole length of the building, were two other rooms, together equal to it. One was Mrs. Lilley's bed-room, the other Sergeant Lilley's office. Behind these were two smaller rooms, one a bath-room, behind Mrs. Lilley's bed-room; the other a servants' room, behind Sergeant Lilley's office, from which the sentry could see into the room occupied by Lilley. This relates to the first bungalow in which Lilley was confined.]

The witness stated that ordinarily troop orderly-sergeants would enter the office as early as 2 or 3 a.m., when there were early parades, in order to do their business with Sergeant Lilley. There was a chink between the door of Mrs. Lilley's bed-room and the office-room. The sentries had no business to leave the servants' room at all, unless Lilley went to sit in the verandah, day or night, or to the water-closet, when they had orders to accompany him. In the second bungalow Lilley slept in the front verandah on the east side. As far as he knew, the sentries never entered Mrs. Lilley's bed-room in the second bungalow. Neither Lilley nor his wife ever complained of annoyance from the posting of the sentinels in either bungalow. Saw Mrs. Lilley out several times. The orders did not necessitate any interference with her privacy.

This closed the cross-examination of the witnesses thus far produced.

The prosecution now called additional witnesses in support of the charges against Colonel Crawley.

Troop Sergeant-Major Robert Cotton deposed that he had been ten years and ten months in the regiment, and that he had always considered Lilley a hard-working, industrious, and sober man. On the day of his arrest Lieutenant Fitzsimon gave witness an order about the arrest. Could not say whether it was written or whether Fitzsimon dictated it from writing. Witness took it down in writing. Recollected Colonel Crawley on one occasion making some remarks about the sentries, but did not recollect the purport of the conversation. Witness remarked to Colonel Crawley that Lilley was a married man. Colonel Crawley asked him how he dared disobey his orders or the Major-General's, and gave him orders to go and see that the sentries were properly posted—"that is, inside the quarters." Went with Cornet Snell to post the sentries. Saw Lilley on the morning of his death; he seemed very sick; the surgeon gave him medicine, and in a short time he died.

By leave of the Court, Colonel Crawley postponed his cross-examination of this witness for the present.

Major John Edward Swindley was then called, and said that while the three sergeants were under arrest, a conversation took place in the orderly-room on a Sunday, of which he gave the following account:—

"Colonel Crawley was complaining to the adjutant of the regiment that communications had taken place with the three imprisoned sergeant-majors. Colonel Crawley asked Mr. Fitzsimon if he knew the meaning of close arrest. Mr. Fitzsimon answered, 'I do. It means placing a sentry over the quarters of the prisoner.' Colonel Crawley said, 'No such thing; it means that the sentries are not to lose sight of their prisoner day or night.' Sergeant-Major Cotton was standing in the room, just in front of me, and remarked that Sergeant-Major Lilley was 'a married man.' This observation was followed up by Mr. Fitzsimon, who said that Mrs. Lilley was 'so sick that liniment, or something of that kind, had to be rubbed on her stomach.' Colonel Crawley said, 'He did not care; married or single, officer or soldier, close arrest was close arrest, and he would have his orders carried out.'"

Quartermaster Wooden was present at this conversation, together with Sergeant-Major Cotton and a corporal, or sentry, or both. There were officers also present. He thought Captain Weir was one of them. While Lilley was under arrest a man named Little was brought before witness charged with having allowed communication to take place between Mrs. Gibson and Lilley. Witness found the charge not supported by the evidence; ordered Little to be released and the "crime" to be torn up. Next morning witness was ordered to attend at the orderly-room before Colonel Crawley, who reprimanded him. The "crime" was produced, the fragments having been sewed together. Witness expressed his sorrow, if he had erred in his judgment; but said he had carefully examined the witnesses and had decided that there was nothing against the prisoner. Colonel Crawley said to him that upon the evidence he had heard he would have tried the man by Court-martial. Lilley bore the highest character in the regiment. Witness was dissatisfied with the way in which Lieutenant Fitzsimon carried on the duties of adjutant, but did not remember expressing himself to that effect to any one. [This refers to a statement in Colonel Crawley's letter, above alluded to, to the Commander-in-Chief, in which the Colonel asserted that, a few days after he joined the regiment, Major (then Captain) Swindley spoke of Fitzsimon's defective vision as an argument to "turn him out of his adjutancy."] Never said that Fitzsimon had defective vision; believed, on the contrary, that he had very good eye-sight. Witness asked leave to add to his account of the conversation in the orderly-room that "Colonel Crawley prefaced the observation about close arrest by saying that he did 'not care a d—, married or single, officer or soldier,' &c."

Captain Archibald Weir was next called, and gave the following account of the scene in the orderly-room:—

"While the sergeant-majors were under arrest, I remember being in the orderly-room at Mhow about the beginning of May, 1862. Colonel Crawley and the adjutant, then Mr. Fitzsimon, came in. The Colonel was talking in a loud voice to Mr. Fitzsimon. The Colonel said, 'Mr. Fitzsimon, do you know what close arrest means?' Mr. Fitzsimon said, 'I think I do, sir.' Colonel Crawley asked him what it was. Mr. Fitzsimon said, 'When an officer or non-commissioned officer is placed in close arrest, and a sentry is placed over him outside the room door, I call that close arrest.' The Colonel replied, 'You do, do you?' Mr. Fitzsimon said, 'Yes, sir, I do.' The Colonel said, 'Then, Mr. Fitzsimon, let me tell you when an officer or non-commissioned officer is placed in close arrest, the sentry is never

to lose sight of him by night or day.' Mr. Fitzsimon said, just that way, 'Very well, sir.' Sergeant-Major Cotton, who was in the orderly-room at the time, made some remark about Sergeant-Major Lilley being a married man. The Colonel told the sergeant-major to hold his tongue, and not contradict the orders he had given or the General, but to go and see those orders carried out. The sergeant-major then left the orderly-room, and Mr. Fitzsimon made some remark about Mrs. Lilley being very ill, and the sergeant-major having some liniment or ointment, I think he called it, to rub on Mrs. Lilley at night-time or in the day. I don't know which. The Colonel then replied, 'I don't care a d—, Mr. Fitzsimon. I can't help that; officer or soldier, married or single, I will have my orders carried out.' This is all, sir, I know about it."

Witness stated that Lilley bore a most excellent character in the regiment.

Quartermaster Wooden was called and examined with reference to this conversation; and gave the same account of it. Witness was sure that Colonel Crawley, after the words "married or single, officer or soldier, close arrest means close arrest," added, "And by G— I will have it carried out." Witness said that on the 3rd of October Colonel Crawley sent for him, and asked him whether he had seen a letter in the *Deccan Herald*, signed by Paymaster Smales, referring to this conversation. The Colonel said that he could not bring it to his recollection that such a conversation had passed, and asked witness if he would put down in writing what he (witness) then said to him. The witness did so in a letter of which this is the principal paragraph:—

"Shortly after the regimental sergeant-major and the two troop sergeant-majors were placed under arrest, I was present one morning at the regimental orderly-room when you told Adjutant Fitzsimon that you had received information to the effect that the regimental sergeant-major had intercourse with people, and asked him (the adjutant) whether he knew the meaning of close arrest; that it meant that the sentry should not lose sight of his prisoner, or should never lose sight of his prisoner."

Witness stated that when Lilley's first quarters were ordered to be vacated, he suggested to Colonel Crawley to quarter him in the staff sergeant's quarters, which had just been given over to the regiment, and were situated about a quarter of a mile from the barracks.

"Colonel Crawley asked me if I could place him nowhere else. I replied I had no other place except a married man's quarters. Colonel Crawley replied, 'Neither will do. The one is too far, the other is too open, and Lilley will be up to some more tricks.' The Colonel directed me then to give that staff-sergeant's quarter to the quarter-master-sergeant, to remove the troop sergeant-major of H troop, and to place Sergeant-Major Lilley in the troop-sergeant's quarters. I remarked to the Colonel that the quarters were very small. The Colonel said, 'The quarters good for one sergeant-major are good for another.' I remarked, 'But the troop sergeant-major is a single man.' The Colonel got rather passionate, and said, 'I don't want any more "buts"; do as I tell you.' I then gave orders for the troop sergeant-major to vacate the bungalow where he was, and to move Sergeant-Major Lilley into it."

Lilley was a good non-commissioned officer and soldier; a very steady, sober man.

Private John Little was next examined. He stated that to the best of his recollection he was sentry over Lilley on the 8th of May, and was posted in the room next to Mrs. Lilley's bedroom, two or three paces from the bedroom-door. Mrs. Gibson came at eight o'clock. Thought he heard somebody at the door. He went to see, and the relief came in. When relieved he went out, and saw Mrs. Gibson at the back-door, speaking to Mrs. Lilley. He was marched off to the guard-room, was reported by the corporal of the guard, and ordered to be confined. Never saw Mrs. Gibson till he came out of the bungalow to be marched away.

Private James Reynolds was next called. He was orderly-room clerk at the time of Lilley's arrest. Remembered Colonel Crawley speaking to Mr. Fitzsimon in his own bungalow, when the orderly-room was held, about a sentry over Lilley being posted outside instead of inside. Sergeant-Major Cotton reminded Colonel Crawley that Lilley was a married man. Colonel Crawley replied, "Officer or soldier, married or single, the duty must be done," or words to that effect.

Private James Reynolds was recalled, and gave Lilley the highest character. Had never once seen him drunk.

Colonel Henry Dalrymple White, Assistant Adjutant-General of Cavalry, C.B., examined, said he had known Lilley well, and considered him a most excellent soldier, and one of the most sober and steady men he had ever met with. Had known him since he joined the 6th Dragoons as a recruit in 1843.

Major John E. Swindley was then recalled and cross-examined by Colonel Crawley.

Admitted that the Court-martial at Mhow condemned him for the strong *animus* he had shown against Colonel Crawley in giving his evidence, but he disclaimed having shown any *animus* until the 3rd or 4th question was put to him, when Colonel Crawley jumped up and exclaimed, "I protest against the way Major Swindley is quibbling with my question."

"I appealed to the protection of the Court, and begged that the words Colonel Crawley had uttered might be recorded on the proceedings. The President, in a most angry way, said there was nothing to record; that it was not a protest. I answered that Colonel Crawley had made use of the very word 'protest,' and begged

a second time that it might be recorded on the proceedings. It was not recorded."

Admitted that in private life he had exhibited a strong feeling of hostility against Colonel Crawley, but never in public life. In private conversation Colonel Crawley had once asked if he "never forgave," and he answered, "No—I do not." Asked, if that remark was made with reference to his superior officer Brigadier Hobson, because he had found it necessary to make some reprimand of the regiment,—he answered, that it was made during a conversation he and Colonel Crawley had had with regard to Hobson, but could not say whether the remark itself was made with regard to Hobson. Colonel Crawley had found fault with witness; but, witness thought, without occasion. Witness did not remember having resented any reprimand of Colonel Crawley's. Sir Hugh Rose did remark that witness in his evidence before the Mhow Court-martial convicted himself of having used towards Colonel Crawley, in the orderly-room, "insubordinate, disrespectful, and defiant language."

Questioned with regard to his examination of Private Little, witness stated that on hearing the evidence against Little he absolved him from all blame. Asked, why he had "admonished" Little—as it appears from a paper handed to witness he had—he replied that the word "admonished" was a mistake of witness's. He ought to have written "released." It was only the second time he had adjudicated in the orderly-room during his period of service. He left the paper blank in the first instance. It was sent to him by Colonel Crawley in the afternoon to fill up, and he thought that not having punished the prisoner, he was not wrong in putting "admonished." If he had thought more over it he should have put "released."

Examined with regard to the conversation in the orderly-room, witness said he was quite sure that it took place on a Sunday, and that Colonel Crawley used the words, "I don't care a —." Had never been inside Lilley's quarters, and could not say whether they were unfit for human habitation. Had been in similar quarters, and should say that for married people, shut up and confined in them, they were unfit. There were married families of non-commissioned officers and soldiers lodged in similar, he could not say worse, quarters; but there is a great deal of difference between being shut up and living in quarters. Had heard that Mrs. Lilley was confined to the house by sickness, and believed it. Had never been in Lilley's first quarters. His own sergeant-major's quarters were similar to Lilley's second quarters, and they had only one room, an outer verandah, and an inner verandah. Had seen Lilley taking exercise in the morning; could not say in the evening. Had never heard the inner verandah called a room before. Asked, "If he had always taken care, when the subject was discussed in his presence, to state that the quarters in which Lilley died were similar to those occupied by his own sergeant-major?" Answered, "As I knew nothing about the quarters of Sergeant-Major Lilley, excepting my own recollection of their being similar to that of my sergeant-major, I should not have considered it my duty to take notice of any remark made about the quarters."

"Now, Major Swindley, I must ask you to answer this question carefully. Will you undertake to say that you have never sought to give the impression to other people, and conveyed the belief to them, that Sergeant-Major and Mrs. Lilley were during the whole time of his arrest shut up in one room?—If I ever did speak about it to other persons I certainly should have done so—not during the whole course of the arrest, but during the latter part of the arrest, as, from the recollection which I had of my own sergeant-major's quarters, I believe them to have been shut up in one room."

Witness declined to state when he had last seen or received any written communication from Mr. Smales; not, "certainly," because the answer might criminate him, but because he did not consider it a proper question. The President observing that, if the answer would not criminate him, he was bound to give it, he declared himself ready to do so; but Colonel Crawley was satisfied with the answer already given.

"Colonel Horsford (the official prosecutor).—Will you be good enough to give me an answer to that question respecting Mr. Smales?—I saw Mr. Smales no later than Sunday last. I cannot say when I received his last written communication."

"Had you any communication with him on Sunday last?—Yes, I had. Mr. Smales called on me at my lodgings."

Troop Sergeant-Major Robert Cotton was next recalled and cross-examined.

He and his wife were intimate friends of Mr. and Mrs. Lilley. One of Lilley's children died prior to the arrival of the regiment at Mhow in December, 1861. Did not know when the other died. Did not know whether Mrs. Lilley was confined to her bed during Lilley's arrest, but believed she visited witness's wife at his house. To the best of his recollection, the conversation in the orderly-room took place on a Sunday. It was about the beginning of May; to the best of his recollection about a week after the arrest.

Colonel Archibald Weir was then recalled and examined.

He was censured by the Court-martial at Mhow for the *animus* he had shown against Colonel Crawley in giving his testimony before the Court. Believed that one of the first acts Colonel Crawley was called on to do after he, the Colonel, joined the regiment, was to address a reprimand to witness for his insubordinate conduct towards his superior officer.

A letter from Colonel C. H. Somerset, "Deputy-Adjutant-

General, her Majesty's Forces, Bombay," conveying the reprimand, was produced.

Cross-examination continued:—The transaction to which that letter refers took place just before Colonel Crawley joined the regiment. Shortly afterwards Colonel Crawley found fault with certain things in the interior economy of the regiment at the first inspection by Brigadier Hobson, which took place after Colonel Crawley's arrival.

Colonel Horsford objected that there should be some limit put to these irrelevant matters. The President concurred.

Witness did not consider Colonel Crawley's strictures, on the occasion referred to, equally misplaced to those of Brigadier Hobson. He thought that Colonel Crawley's "getting those cleaning-bags into uniformity" was rather a benefit to the system than otherwise. Witness said at the Mhow Court-Martial that, with the exception of Paymaster Smales, he thought Colonel Crawley had displayed "a conciliatory spirit towards the officers." To the best of witness's belief the conversation spoken to in the orderly-room took place on a Sunday. He was not positive: it was either on a Saturday or a Sunday. Could not say how long after the arrest, perhaps a week—about a week; it might be more or less. Mr. Fitzsimon was adjutant at the time, and was in the orderly-room. Did not know that Mrs. Lilley was subjected to indignity and her privacy intruded upon during Lilley's arrest, as he was not in either of the bungalows when Mrs. Lilley was there. The quarters in which Lilley died were "certainly not" unfit for human habitation. After Mrs. Lilley's death, had heard a Mrs. Gibson say that Mrs. Lilley was annoyed, and could not do anything in her own bungalow without the sentry seeing her.

To the President.—Mrs. Lilley complained to Mrs. Gibson that she was annoyed by the sentries.

Witness had never, since he came to England, heard any remarks made in his presence as to the unhealthiness of the quarters in which Lilley was placed under arrest. Had not had any communication whatever with Mr. Smales.

Re-examined by Colonel Horsford:—The authorities in India had not, as far as he knew, sent Mrs. Gibson to this country with the other witnesses.

Quartermaster Charles Wooden was next cross-examined.

Witness could not recollect the date or day on which the conversation spoken to in the orderly-room took place. He spoke to the words used in that conversation to the best of his recollection. Wrote the letter in October, 1862, at the Colonel's own request, and confined himself to simply answering his questions. If the Colonel had put more questions he would have answered them. [See the material portion of the letter above.]

Colonel Crawley asked the witness whether he did not call witness's attention to a passage in a letter which appeared in the *Deccan Herald*, in which Paymaster Smales declared Colonel Crawley's statement before the Mhow Court-martial—to the effect that no one could be more shocked than himself when he heard that Mrs. Lilley had been subjected to annoyance, and that the fault was Lieutenant Fitzsimon's—to be false; the letter then proceeded thus:—

"The following are the facts. Upon Lieutenant-Colonel Crawley giving the order for sentries to be placed over these men, Quartermaster Wooden, an open-hearted generous soldier, to his glory be it said, himself having been a regimental sergeant-major, reminded Lieutenant-Colonel Crawley that Sergeant-Major Lilley was a married man, adding, if my memory serves me rightly, that his wife was sick. The reply he received was, 'Married or single, officer or soldier, the sentry must do his duty; close arrest—the sentry has no right to lose sight of his prisoner.' These were the sentiments, if not the exact words, made use of in the presence of the three officers named, and well were these orders carried out; for the sentry did not lose sight of his prisoner until he was taken a corpse from his bungalow."

Witness said that his attention was not called to the passage. He was simply asked by Colonel Crawley whether he had stated to Mr. Smales that this statement was false, and witness told Colonel Crawley that he had not spoken to Mr. Smales on the subject. The passage in the letter was not pointed out to him; a simple reference was made to it. Colonel Crawley asked him to contradict a paragraph in which witness's name was mentioned as one of the persons from whom Mr. Smales had heard Colonel Crawley's statement before the Court-martial contradicted; and also to state as nearly as he could recollect what passed at the orderly-room at the time. Part of that conversation, as already stated, Colonel Crawley would not permit witness to enter in his letter. [We may here add a portion of the witness's evidence in chief, which we have not hitherto given, with reference to the letter he wrote at the Colonel's request:—"When I had written that letter—before I had finished it—the remark about the sergeant-major being married and his sick wife occurred to me. It had not been made by me, but by either the adjutant or the acting sergeant-major; but I asked the Colonel whether I should add that to the letter. The Colonel said, 'No; what you have stated is quite sufficient.' I then signed the letter and gave it to the Colonel. The Colonel asked me no further questions, and I left the bungalow.] Asked if on the occasion when witness wrote his letter, Colonel Crawley did not, in the presence of Lieutenant Wallis, request him to write down all he could recollect on that occasion, and whether witness did not, in the presence of Mr. Wallis, say that his letter contained the whole of what he could recollect—witness answered, "Decidedly not."

A letter dated Mhow, January 1st, 1863, written by the witness.

t Colonel Crawley, was produced and admitted by the witness to be in his writing. It referred first to some remarks in the *Army and Navy Gazette* of November, 1862, with regard to which witness wrote that he was present on the parade alluded to, and that Colonel Crawley's remarks, after the reading of the Court-martial, were not, in witness's opinion, made "in a state of frenzy;" that Colonel Crawley spoke well of the conduct of the men but could not say as much of the officers, not having received that support from them which was due to him. The letter went on to say:—

"With reference to the orders to the sentry placed over Sergeant-Major Lilley, I do not remember that the word 'd—' was used by you. I did write these circumstances down as stated, feeling confident of being called upon, sooner or later, to certify to these circumstances; but shortly after, on second consideration, I destroyed the papers, determined to trust to memory only. When asked by you whether a statement which appeared in the *Deccan Herald* was correct, I did not answer, 'Yes,' but that 'It was partly correct,' and at your desire made a written statement."

Witness could not recollect when he made the notes or when he destroyed them. He destroyed them because he had read in the proceedings of a Court-martial held lately that it was wrong for an officer to keep a diary. He destroyed them then, determined to trust to his memory. Had always been blessed with a very good memory. The staff sergeant's quarters of which he had spoken [on examination-in-chief] were, as nearly as he could remember, about a quarter of a mile from the barracks. They were nearer to Paymaster Smales's compound than they were to the barracks. If the guard came from the main guard-room they would have to pass Mr. Smales's house. This, however, would depend on the road they took, and there were three ways of going to the staff sergeant's quarters. The married quarters, of which witness had spoken in his examination-in-chief, were under one roof, divided from each other by mud and wattle partitions—patcheries—which were open at the top. The height of each partition was 6½ feet; thickness, about 6 to 7 inches. The partitions were not open at the top throughout; six or seven walls intervened in the range. Each compartment was divided into married men's quarters. The compartments were each open at the top.

Private Reynolds was next recalled for cross-examination. Was present when Private Little was brought before Major Swindley, charged with having allowed Mrs. Gibson to communicate with Lilley. Major Swindley admonished the prisoner, and said he ought not to have been confined for such a trivial crime. The conversation spoken to in the orderly-room was on the same day, or a few days afterwards. Remembered Colonel Crawley, on one occasion when the orderly-room was in Mr. Fitzsimon's house, remarking upon the sentry stationed over Lilley being out in the sun about midday, and ordering the sentry to be placed inside under cover. This occurred about midday; between twelve and one. Believed that Colonel Crawley sent Mr. Fitzsimon himself to see that the Colonel's order was carried out. This was within six or seven days after the arrest.

Here terminated the cross-examination of the witnesses produced up to this point.

Additional evidence was now produced for the prosecution.

Sergeant John Gibson examined: Deposed that he had known Lilley seventeen or eighteen years. He bore an excellent character in all respects. Witness was provost-sergeant at the time of his arrest. Was standing in the passage of the orderly-room, and heard Colonel Crawley give Mr. Fitzsimon an order to have the sentries placed so that they should not lose sight of their prisoner day or night. Sergeant-Major Cotton said that Lilley was a married man, and that his wife was very ill. Colonel Crawley said he "did not care a d—, officer or non-commissioned officer, an order was an order, and should be obeyed." Was sure it was Cotton who said that Mrs. Lilley was ill. Major Swindley, Captain Weir, Mr. Fitzsimon, Quartermaster Wooden, Sergeant-Major Cotton, and witness were present. Mrs. Lilley lived in witness's bungalow for the fortnight before she died. She used about a bottle of brandy and a bottle of port-wine every two days.

Colonel Crawley postponed his cross-examination.

Cross-examined by Colonel Crawley. His wife attended Mrs. Lilley in her last illness, gave her medicine and brandy, and rubbed the liniment into her chest and shoulder.

Mr. Edward Griffiths Syms, confidential clerk in the Adjutant-General's Office, produced an original letter from Colonel Crawley to the deputy adjutant-general, Mhow division, dated the 4th of June, 1862, and marked "Immediate."

The letter stated, in effect, that the three sergeants had been placed under arrest "with the sanction" of the major-general, afterwards confirmed by the Commander-in-chief; that in consequence of the impossibility of preventing communication being held with them by parties in the interest of Paymaster Smales, it was deemed advisable to place the sentries in the rooms with the prisoners, "not only to avoid the exposure of the sentries to the sun and hot winds, but to prevent the witnesses being tampered with during the remainder of the trial; that, in Lilley's case, there were three or four rooms in his quarters, and there was no necessity for his domestic arrangements being interfered with or his wife annoyed; that when, a few days after the arrest, Colonel Crawley learnt that the sentry had been "most injudiciously placed" by Lieutenant Fitzsimon so as to cause annoyance to Mrs. Lilley, he sent Mr. Fitzsimon immediately to withdraw the sentry from the presence of Mrs. Lilley and place him where he

could not annoy her; that through the neglect or connivance of one of the sentries a communication was opened with the sergeant-major by a woman of the regiment; that on the termination of Mr. Smales' defence, Colonel Crawley obtained permission to enlarge the arrest, which he obtained and acted upon the following day; that Lilley died of a sudden attack of apoplexy about four P.M. on the 25th of May, thus giving a handle for the unfounded statements in the newspapers as to the penal character of the arrest of the three sergeants; that owing to press of official business Colonel Crawley had been unable to proceed with his reply to Smales' defence as early as he could have desired, and that, therefore, his Excellency's instructions relative to the final release from arrest of the sergeant-majors had not yet been carried out.

Cornet William Thomas Skinner Snell was then called for the prosecution.

He was acting adjutant of the 6th Dragoons from about the morning of the 4th to the morning of the 8th of May, 1862. Colonel Crawley sent for him to the mess-room on the day when Lilley gave his evidence in Court,—he thought the 7th of May,—and told him that Lilley had complained in the Court of the manner of the arrest. He thought the Colonel said that Lilley complained that the sentry was within two feet of his wife's bed. The Colonel asked if this was true, and witness replied, "The sentry is inside the bungalow, next Mrs. Lilley's bedroom;" and said he understood that the order to place him there was given by the Colonel. Colonel Crawley asked him if he knew what close arrest meant, and told him to go and see that his orders were carried out. Witness went and changed the position of the sentry, placing him in the lobby, or small room next the dining-room [the servants' room above mentioned], with orders that he was in no way to interfere with Mrs. Lilley, but not to lose sight of Lilley unless he went into his wife's bedroom. On the same day, after the Court-martial on Smales had adjourned, he went to Colonel Crawley with regimental papers, and handed him a written copy of the order he, witness, had that morning given the sentry over Lilley. Colonel Crawley handed it back without reading it, saying, "Do you think, Mr. Snell, I am a lance-corporal, to write out orders for a guard?" Did not know what had become of those orders. Their substance he had already stated. While witness acted as adjutant the sentry several times gave up his orders to him, and they were to the effect that he was to keep his prisoner in sight, and to allow no one to enter the bungalow except the medical officer.

Sergeant George Barnard was then called for the prosecution.

Had known Lilley about eight years before he died. He was always a very sober, steady man. Witness was present at the conversation in the orderly-room, and gave substantially the same account of it as was given by previous witnesses. When told that Mrs. Lilley was sick and had to be rubbed with a liniment, Colonel Crawley said he did not care a —, there were the orders, and he would have them carried out.

Mrs. Anne Cotton (wife of Sergeant-Major Cotton) was next called, and gave the following account of Lilley's death:—

"On the evening of the 24th of May, 1862, about ten minutes past ten, I was called upon by Mrs. Lilley to come into her quarters, as her husband was very ill and herself not able to move in her bed. I did not go when she first called me, but about ten minutes after she called again; I then went in, and found Sergeant-Major Lilley very ill. He asked me to send for the doctor, which I did. I stayed with him until about ten minutes to one. I then returned to my quarters and remained about a quarter of an hour, when Mrs. Lilley called to me again, and said her husband was dying. I immediately went in and found him still worse. He looked at me very hard, and Mrs. Lilley said, 'Do you know who that is?' He said, 'Yes, it is Mrs. Cotton.' He then took my hand, and said, 'Mrs. Cotton, I am dying.' I said, 'Don't say so, Lilley, you will soon be better.' He said, 'No, my child; I never shall.' He then took my hand again, and said, 'Good-bye, may God bless you!' I then assisted Mrs. Lilley from the bed where her husband was dying, and laid her on a sofa until all was over. I then had her removed into my own quarters, where she remained until about a fortnight before her death."

Assistant-Surgeon Oliver Barnett was next examined for the prosecutor.

Had attended Mrs. Lilley for more than six months before Lilley's arrest, and from that time to her death. Her disorder was consumption, and she was in a declining state. Witness could see the sentry from Mrs. Lilley's bed-room in the first bungalow. Spoke to her in an undertone as otherwise the sentry could hear him. The room was contiguous to the water-closet. Mrs. Lilley was confined to her bed during a great part of each day. Some days when she was better she sat up part of the day; but in many others she was worse and was confined to bed the whole day. In the second bungalow the sentry stood at the door dividing the two rooms outside, the chick which was hung in the doorway. Mrs. Lilley's bed stood nearly in the centre of the large room, in the north-west angle, with the head towards the west wall, about two feet from the wall, and the side also about two feet from the north wall. Had no recollection of ever seeing a curtain hung across the room in that bungalow. The first bungalow was preferable, as far as Mrs. Lilley's comforts were concerned, to the second. Witness, speaking professionally, considered that the position of the sentry was an annoyance to Mrs. Lilley, who was then so seriously ill. Considered that the position of the sentry during the whole period of Lilley's arrest must have been an annoyance to Mrs. Lilley. Colonel Crawley never consulted witness with reference to the position of the sentry in either bungalow which would least interfere with

Mrs. Lilley's convenience. Never remembered the inconvenience being lessened at any time by altering the position of the sentry. Mrs. Lilley used three or four glasses of brandy daily on witness's recommendation. She might have taken four or five, considering her extreme debility, without injury. Lilley was a sober, steady man; never saw any appearance of drinking about him before or during his arrest. As far as witness recollected he first had leave to take exercise about the 30th of April; and to sit in the verandah about the end of May; but witness could not say exactly. On the 9th of June, Colonel Crawley asked witness if he had any notion how much brandy Lilley drank during his confinement. Witness said "No," because he had never observed the slightest appearance of drink upon him. Colonel Crawley said he had twenty-three bottles of brandy, about twelve pints of ale, a bottle or two of port wine, and a bottle of gin. Witness asked Colonel Crawley "if he was to make any addition to the report of the sergeant-major's case, in reference to the quantity of liquor supplied to him during his arrest." The Colonel said, "No, I have done it," or "I will do it, in my report." Witness made a *post-mortem* examination of Lilley. He died from heat-apoplexy. He was an enormously stout man, and predisposed to congestion. Witness made a medical report of the case to Dr. Turnbull.

The report was produced. It stated in effect that Lilley was a strong, healthy, and robust man, inclined to corpulency, and had always enjoyed good health; and described the progress of his illness from the time when he was reported sick on the morning of the 24th of May, with the treatment, till he died the next morning at 4 A.M. It then proceeded thus:—

"The extreme heat at this season of the year, the constitutional predisposition of the deceased to congestion, the peculiar and painful circumstances of his position, the serious illness of his wife causing a depression of spirits, together with bilious and nervous derangement induced by the sedentary life attendant on close arrest on a man of the sergeant-major's active habits, probably acted as exciting causes to produce the complaint from which he died."

Witness considered this report correct, and did not wish to qualify it.

(To be continued.)

KNOX v. GYE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "LONDON REVIEW."

SIR,—My attention has been called to an article in your paper of last Saturday, headed "Colonel Knox and his Opera Box." Some of the statements in this article are inaccurate, and its general tone, if unanswered, might convey an impression to your readers by no means favourable to myself. I therefore trust you will have the kindness to insert in your next impression the following short history of the most salient points of Colonel Knox's connection with the opera.

The proceedings in Chancery show that, in the autumn of the year 1850, Colonel Knox offered to back me if I took the Opera House. I told him that I had a handsome income, but not the capital to meet such a loss as might arise in so large a concern. He then said that he had an income of £7,000 a year, that he had a sum of about £12,000 due for interest on an Irish mortgage, and that he had now only one son to provide for; in fact, leading me to believe that he was a rich man, and that the loss of a few thousands would be of no consequence to him.

After I had made many heavy engagements, and taken on myself large liabilities, and the opera season (1851) approached, Colonel Knox told me that his Irish money had not been paid, and it soon appeared that he could not advance me the £5,000 he had promised. On this I procured the co-operation of other friends (mentioned in the Chancery proceedings). I borrowed £10,000 on the joint and several bond of Colonel Knox, Sir W. de Bathe, and myself; but as to money, Colonel Knox did not advance a shilling. After the end of the season 1851, which resulted in a gross profit of upwards of £4,000, the bond was paid off and cancelled, and Sir W. de Bathe and the other friends alluded to then left the concern.

I now (the autumn of 1851) reminded Colonel Knox of what I had in the first instance told him, viz., that although I had a good income, I had not the capital to meet a large loss, and that, as Sir W. de Bathe had left, if a loss should occur, the whole of it must fall on him (Knox). I further reminded him that I should require the sum of £10,000 before the next season began; he said he was sure the concern was a good one, and that I should make a fortune by it; that Her Majesty's Theatre would not open again, &c.; and that he should be sure to have his Irish money paid, which was now increased by the addition of penal interest, and that he would pay the whole of the £10,000 down before the season began.

It will, I think, scarcely be believed that when the season approached Colonel Knox could not produce any money, and that I was forced to borrow the sum of £10,000 on the joint security of Knox and myself, to which I added other collateral securities. So that instead of Colonel Knox advancing me the money he had promised, it was I who was actually obliged to be security for him.

The seasons of 1852 and 1853 entailed a large loss, and the repayment of this £10,000 was demanded. Colonel Knox was applied to, and, after great pressure, paid off the half of the sum, viz., £5,000. This was in October, 1853. Colonel Knox succeeded in getting payment of the remaining £5,000 postponed, on the plea (as sworn to by the acting partner, and by the manager in the bank

of Messrs. Coutts & Co.) that he was not my partner, and that he had been my security only as a disinterested friend.

In your article it is stated that Colonel Knox has spent a total of £20,000 on the opera. Permit me to say that, beyond this £5,000, Colonel Knox has never put a farthing into the concern; and it now turns out that, so far from being in a position to support such an establishment as the opera, he was actually obliged to borrow every shilling of this £5,000 through the expensive medium of insurance offices, insuring his life and getting friends to be security for him.

On the other hand, I have put into the concern, without reckoning the cost of the building of the new theatre, a sum exceeding £26,000. Colonel Knox once put his name for me to an acceptance for £1,000, which I paid, and on another occasion he lent me £500, which I also repaid with interest.

On one occasion Colonel Knox applied to me to accept two bills for him, of £500 each, for his own private uses. I did so; he discounted these bills and had the money, and paid the bills when due. I may here remark that, previous to my acquaintance with Colonel Knox, I never in my life had put my name to a bill or an acceptance. At the time when Mr. Thistlethwayte first joined the concern, I believe Colonel Knox assisted him (with his name) in raising his money, as he (Mr. Thistlethwayte) did not come into his property for some months afterwards.

You now, Sir, have a short sketch of every money transaction which ever took place between Colonel Knox and myself, and will be able to judge how far Colonel Knox has assisted me in my opera undertaking, which has ranged over fourteen years, and involved an expenditure of upwards of £750,000, and how far I have, as your article says, "killed the golden goose."

I regret to say that on many points Colonel Knox's statements and my own in the Chancery proceedings were in direct contradiction. Suffice it to say that my own were, for the most part, confirmed by entries in my diaries, which diaries were all inspected by Colonel Knox's solicitor; and that, in addition to my affidavit, Colonel Knox's statements were directly contradicted, in some instances by his own letters, and in others, on oath by twenty-seven different witnesses.

I will not enter into the terms on which Colonel Knox became connected with the opera; that my version was the true one has been decided by the Vice-Chancellor, who dismissed Colonel Knox's bill and condemned him to pay the whole of the costs up to the hearing.

The article in your paper certainly leads to the inference that Colonel Knox is the injured person in these transactions, but I would ask, even according to his own statements, whether his monetary position was such as could have justified his joining so great an undertaking as the Royal Italian Opera? If I had treated him as my partner, as he now says he was, and had called upon him to contribute his share of the losses, does it appear that he had any means whatever of paying such amounts? It is quite evident he had not. The truth is, I am the person who has suffered, for Colonel Knox led me to believe that he was a rich man, and induced me to undertake this harassing speculation, the arduous duties of which caused me to neglect other pursuits which had for many previous years produced me a very considerable income.

I will conclude these observations with the following letter to Mr. Smith, Colonel Knox's solicitor, which, I hope, will speak for itself.

"Royal Italian Opera, Covent Garden, June 17th, 1862.

"DEAR SIR,—Mr. Tamplin has sent me a copy of your letter to him, dated June 12th. In this letter you mention the sum of £8,000, offered by Mr. P—, as if that had been a question between us at our late interview here. As this was a personal communication between you and myself, I should not like any misconception to exist concerning it. You will remember my having told you when I had the pleasure of seeing you at Mr. P—'s house in January last, that I had not authorized Mr. P— to offer the £8,000, although, on finding that he had offered that sum, I had agreed to carry it out had it been accepted. That offer was, however, disposed of at the time, it having been refused by Colonel Knox. I then, on the same day (January 13th), told you that although I did not owe Colonel Knox one farthing, I should be willing, as between one gentleman and another, and for peace sake, to return him the £5,000 he placed in the opera. I also added that I would give him 5 per cent. per annum on that sum from the time it was advanced, and, moreover, that I would make him a present, if he would accept of them, of all the boxes he had during the opera seasons, including the one on the pit-tier, which he had regularly for eight or nine years. Last week, when we accidentally met here, I repeated this offer even more explicitly. I told you that, from the terms on which Colonel Knox advanced the £5,000, I neither legally nor morally owed him a shilling; still that it had always been my wish to return him that sum, if possible. I then begged you to make Colonel Knox this offer: viz., to give him the £5,000 at once, also 5 per cent. per annum interest from the time that sum was advanced, amounting to £2,250, to be paid in three yearly payments; and beyond this to give him all the boxes, &c., which he had had the value of, which was considerably above £3,000. I think, and I do not doubt, that Colonel Knox's own friends would think that this offer is most liberal, and one which shows that I have made every possible effort to avoid a public lawsuit, in which it is quite evident that the recrimination must be most painful to our families and friends, and in which the solemn oaths of two men who were once most intimate friends will be on many points diametrically opposed to each other.

"My object in writing this letter is that I wish it to be clearly understood that the above offer is the one which has been the subject of discussion during the past week, and not that which Mr. P—

made in January last, which was then disposed of by Colonel Knox having rejected it. "I remain, dear Sir, yours faithfully,

"H. Smith, Esq."

"FREDERICK GYE.

I beg to apologize for intruding on your space at such length, and am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Royal Italian Opera, Covent Garden,
November 24th, 1863.

FREDERICK GYE.

THE CHURCH.

SAINTS AND THEIR LEGENDS.

3.—THE RELICS OF THE SAINTS.

Of all the superstitions of the Romish Church, perhaps the least reasonable and the most degrading is the worship of relics, yet it is one which found its way into the Church at an early period. People soon began to adopt the belief that inanimate objects became endowed with the power of working miracles; not only the bones of the martyrs, but every object which had been made use of in their martyrdom, or had even touched their bodies in their "passions," their clothing, the articles on which their blood fell, the cinders from the fires with which they were burnt, even the lamps which had been lit before their bodies, or the flowers which had been scattered over them—all became equally relics. Moreover, it was a case in which the well-known rule in mathematics was reversed, for here a part was equal to the whole, inasmuch as it did not require the whole body of a saint to work a miracle—the least bone of his frame was equally efficient. Thus, the saint was soon distributed over the world in small fragments. Any one who could obtain a bit of a saint's bone, often carried it about his person as an amulet; and it was a subject of exultation to possess such an object, or any other relic, in the house. People relied upon such things for the cure of diseases, instead of applying to physicians, and they trusted to them for safety under many circumstances. Philippe le Long, King of France, when he was suffering from a quartain fever, submitted to be touched with the holy nail and the arm of St. Simeon, preserved in St. Denis, and believed that he was cured by this application; the Duke of Normandy, son of Philippe de Valois, was cured of a serious disease by similar means; another French monarch, Charles le Bel, always carried relics with him; and Louis XI. had them brought to him on his death-bed, imagining that still through them his life might be preserved.

It appears that the first great impulse was given to the multiplication of relics by the pretended discovery of the true cross by the Empress Helena, after which the rage for the possession of them became so great that St. Cyril of Jerusalem boasted that the whole world had been filled with bits of the true cross, and asserted at the same time, as another of its miraculous characteristics, that the cross remained still entire. The great sources of famous relics, in the earlier times especially, were Rome and the East, and the missionaries who went to convert distant regions, carried relics with them as an important part of their equipment, and the taste for them was thus spread into the most remote regions, where, however, it was not long before rich crops of such fruit grew up among themselves. Thus, according to the legend as told in Bede, when Germanus went into Britain to combat the heresy of Pelagius, he took with him thither "relics of all the apostles and of several martyrs," and these it appears from the context he carried in a casket hung round his neck. The Crusades again opened the East to the peoples of the West, who became seized with an absolute rage for such objects, and kings, princes, and great barons expended immense sums of money in the purchase of them. The saintly Louis IX. of France distinguished himself prominently in this line of commerce, which became no doubt an extremely profitable one to more than one party of those engaged in it. The history of some of the relics which thus travelled westward would be curious, if we could trace all its vicissitudes; and we have still some examples which are by no means unedifying. Some time in the course of the eleventh century a jeweller from Jerusalem brought into Italy a ring, which he stated to be the marriage ring with which the Virgin Mary was espoused to Joseph. An inhabitant of Chiusa bought it of the Jew, intending, as it would seem, to have no sharer in its advantages, for he kept it ten years without making it known. At the end of that time, influenced by some new religious feeling, he presented the ring to one of the churches in that town. It was the tendency of all these relics to go into the possession of the ecclesiastical order, who certainly made more of them than their lay possessors. No sooner, then, had the ring been deposited in the church than it began to be famous for its miracles. In the year 1477, a German Cordelier, who had

the charge of it, stole the ring, and carried it to Perugia, where he gave information of his arrival to the senate and people of the town, who, delighted to obtain such a prize, for it had no doubt proved a very profitable possession, decided that the theft was a pardonable one, and gave the thief a large sum of money as the reward of his dishonesty. The people of Chiusa demanded that their relic should be restored to them; but they encountered a flat refusal, and the Chiusan clergy locked their ring up in a safe place. The Perugians flew to arms, and a civil war would have been the result but for the interference of the Pope, Sixtus IV., who behaved like the arbitrator in the fable, for he seized the object in dispute, and carried it to Rome, thus putting an end to the war by leaving them nothing to quarrel about. But his successor, Innocent VIII., restored the ring to Perugia, where it is still shown. The adventures of another relic are equally singular. When, according to the story, the body of John the Baptist was burnt at Sebaste after he had been put to death, some Christians obtained by stealth a few fragments of his body unconsumed, and among them one of his fingers, the only one which escaped. At a later period St. Tecla purchased this relic, and brought it to Normandy, where she built a church in which it was long preserved. Now, in the year 1437, a young Breton, native of Plougasnou, jealous that so valuable a relic should remain in the possession of the Normans, formed the project of stealing it. The relic, it seems, was tired of its resting-place, or was, for some reason or other, dissatisfied with the Normans, and it sympathised entirely in the plundering designs of the young Breton. When the latter made his approaches with all due precautions, he found that the relic had spontaneously left its reliquary and placed itself under his coat, and he felt himself impelled irresistibly on the road to his native town of Plougasnou, for which John the Baptist's finger evidently felt a decided preference. Indeed, the joy of the relic at its removal was so great that, communicating itself miraculously to the objects around, it was the cause of serious inconvenience to its deliverer; for, as they passed a little town on their way, the bells rung spontaneously, and the trees bowed down to the earth to show their reverence to the travellers. The people in this little town, not very well satisfied with the character of the young Breton,—taking him perhaps for a magician,—seized him and threw him into prison. But the holy finger was not to be thwarted in its design, it carried away its friend through all obstructions, and reached Plougasnou in safety, where the chapel of St. Meriadec opened its doors spontaneously to receive it. It appears to have been completely satisfied with its new asylum. In 1489 the forces of Henry VII. of England plundered Plougasnou, and carried away with them the finger of John the Baptist and the casket in which it was locked up. When the English fleet reached Southampton, the admiral called together the clergy in order to exhibit to them his precious capture; but when he opened the casket before them, it was found to be empty—the holy finger had, in fact, disappeared on the voyage and had returned to Plougasnou. There it is, we believe, still shown, but it has long ceased to perform miracles.

Of the manner in which the relics took care of their own likings and of their own conveniences we have several amusing examples. The body of St. Romuald, who died in the earlier half of the eleventh century, and was the founder of a small order of monks, was preserved at one of his foundations in the Val de Castro, in the marquisate of Ancona. In 1480, two monks stole the body, and carried it to Jesi, in the same marquisate. The body of the saint appears to have been troubled with caprices, for although, as shown in the sequel, it did not want to remain at Val de Castro, yet it showed its displeasure at the manner of its removal by falling into dust, and leaving nothing but the bones to be carried away by the monks. The body soon gave signs of being tired of Jesi, and in due course the monks of Val de Castro went to fetch it back, assisted with an armed force of the townsmen of Fabriano; but the relic had taken a partiality for this latter place, and no force could turn the mule which carried it from the direct road to Fabriano, where it was deposited and became more celebrated for its miracles than in any other place. The body of the famous St. Martin of Tours appears to have submitted to the chances of war with more patience. The spirit left it in 397 at an obscure parish named Cande, on the borders of Poitou, and the possession of it became immediately a subject of dispute between the Poitevins and the Tourangeaux, besides various other minor claimants. After quarrelling all day, they all apparently gave themselves up to rest at night; but, while the others were asleep, the clergy of Tours arose stealthily, took the body, and carried it away. This was not the only case in which the relics of St. Martin became a subject of dispute. During the invasions of the Normans, the body was carried first to Orleans and thence to Auxerre. When the country

was restored to peace, the clergy of Tours demanded the restoration of St. Martin's body, but the Bishop of Auxerre refused to give it up, and their demands might long have proved vain had they not obtained the assistance of a rather turbulent chieftain, Engelger, Count of the Gâtinais, who invaded the territory of Auxerre with his followers in arms, and extorted the relics of the saints from the bishop and his clergy by main force. St. Martin's body was finally received into Tours with great ceremony on the 19th of December, 887.

If we return to our island, we shall find some saints who were equally interested in the position and ease of their own relics. St. Edmund of Canterbury, the Archbishop, died at Pontigni, in France, in 1242. On the day of his burial he only performed three miracles, and discontinued entirely during a period of eight days. The saint then appeared to one of the monks, and begged that he might be disinterred and placed in an easier coffin, informing him at the same time that the cause of the cessation of his miracles was, that they had thrust him into a coffin which was so tight that he could not lift his hands up towards Heaven! Among our Anglo-Saxon saints there was one who seems to have existed almost solely for the purpose of disposing of his relics. "St. Rumwald," says Alban Butler, "died very young." The story which Butler was afraid to repeat, because it was too ridiculous, that veracious old chronicler of the English saints, John Capgrave, recounts with great admiration. Rumwald's mother was a daughter of the ferocious Penda, King of Mercia, and his father King of Northumberland, and immediately the infant came into the world he cried out three times distinctly in Latin, "*Sum Christianus*." He then declared his will to be baptized by Bishop Widerin (?), who was present, and to have for his godfather the priest Eadwald, who was also at hand, and he chose his own name and provided his own font. Rumwald only lived three days, during which the infant saint preached the Gospel to three different districts of the adjacent country. On the third day he died, and was buried at Sutton, the place of his birth, but not until he had directed, by his will, that his body should remain one year only at Sutton; that it should then be removed, for one year only, to Brackley, in Northamptonshire; and that on the third year it should be removed to Buckingham, which was destined to be its final resting-place. All these directions, we are assured, were punctually carried out.

(To be continued.)

IMPROVEMENT OF SMALL BENEFICES.

THANKS to the pressure of public opinion, and the well-merited condemnation of a Parliamentary Committee, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have made a move towards realizing the great purpose for which they were called into being. By an Order in Council, published last Friday, they have made an annual grant of over £6,000, which they have with tardy benevolence scattered in a gracious shower over fifty or sixty poor livings in money, rent-charges, and glebes. It is sincerely to be hoped that these droppings from their groaning table, on which the nation piles up a quarter of a million annually, are but the first-fruits of a far weightier benefaction that shall at some future day delight the hearts of the incumbents of the many other small livings which, we are told, they have the power eventually to raise to £300 a year and a house. Hitherto, by some unaccountable fatality, mismanagement, or defect of organization, the golden stream which should have flowed from the treasury of the Commission in numerous rills, irrigating and enriching the meadows of the Church, has been running in the larger channels into the already rich fields of the Bishops, Deans, lawyers, and managers. There may have been potent reasons—reasons sound and good, though beyond ordinary mortal comprehension—why the comfort of the highest functionaries of the Church should first be cared for. But, with the present happy signs before us, let no man—particularly no unbeneficed or under-beneficed clergyman—question them. Let bygones be bygones. Rather thankfully let every poor incumbent look forward to a happy time coming; and every curate, still in probation on his £80 or £100 a year, rejoice at the prospect, however distant, that, when he does become a rector indeed, it will be to realize Dr. O'Toole's idea of earthly happiness—"£300 a year and the run of the kitchen."

CORRESPONDENCE.

[It must be understood that we do not adopt all the opinions of our correspondents.]

CHURCH REFORM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "LONDON REVIEW."

SIR,—While Church Reformers are studying to procure legal authority for every change which they consider necessary for the welfare of the Church, there are some who are bold enough to make

changes on their own responsibility. I allude to the unauthorized practice of "consecrating" churches and cemeteries, and to the use of "liturgies" for that purpose, composed by bishops and others, without any reference to Convocation.

I send you a few specimens of consecration offices, one of which is entitled "The Service appointed for the Consecration of a Cemetery." Who is authorized to impose such services, and to use them inside the walls of a church, or the precincts of a spot set apart for the purpose of burying the dead according to the Church Burial Service?

These are questions not easily answered. If bishops and rectors may innovate after this fashion, others may do so in another manner. If some may add services, others may with equal lawfulness shorten or leave out services, or parts of the same.

This consecration principle is growing. Lately, in my locality, the foundation-stone of a church, now erecting, was laid. One of the prayers in "the office" used was, "We beseech Thee, O Lord, to bless this stone." It was not added that "this stone might (as a part of the building) become an instrument for the spreading of the Gospel," but simply as I have given it,—"We beseech Thee, O Lord, to bless this stone!" I regarded the language as introducing a new doctrine, one foreign to the Church of England, and which might strictly be denominated as dissent.

Another case occurs to me: the reconsecration of a restored church, to which some additions were made. In this case the bishop's services were required for the consecration of the new portions of brick and mortar. The favour of God was, indeed, petitioned as for the walls, and not as for the worshippers who should become His living temples.

It is well to call attention to the manner in which that sensible man, Archbishop Whately, managed these matters. He simply set apart a church for Divine worship by performing the Morning or Evening Service in it according to the Book of Common Prayer. How distinctly do those bishops who follow any other practice afford an example to others to innovate in other things!

Until any unauthorized service is legalized, the bishops should understand that they are unlawfully employing it, and, in short, that they are laying themselves open to the charge of being Dissenters in high places. All the unauthorized bowings and semi-prostrations and genuflexions at All Saints', Margaret-street, and other churches fall under this head. They are essentially dissenting, inasmuch as they teach doctrine which is not held or taught by the Church of England.

Sir, one grand feature of difference between us and the Roman and Oriental Churches is the absence among us of all prayer for a blessing on things. In both these latter Churches, prayers for the people give place sadly to prayers for a blessing on the things of the house of God.

This subject will no doubt come under your able notice; for assuredly we shall go on driving sensible men from the Church of England so long as we continue to place efficacy in things, and to foist unauthorized services on the people of God for the purpose of recommending them.

L.E.X.

[We have been requested to publish the following letter written by a well-known nobleman in reply to an application made to him for a contribution to the building of a new church.]

SIR,—You write to me for a contribution for a new church, and I naturally regret the deficient accommodation you deplore; but while those who make appeals, on the ground of increase of population and inadequate church room, are so employed, they should reflect that these causes move in a circle, and that as things are now carried on, the first will always more than overtake the sum, whilst the money contributed is more disposed in decorated specimens of architecture than in specific accommodation.

The evil might be overtaken and the charitable purpose answered, it appears to me, by the erection of spacious rooms, economically furnished and untainted by the pew system.

But this is not all. Before the reflecting portion of the Church of England can be satisfied, a revision of the Liturgy must be accorded; and until those who obstruct this necessary reform can be brought to see the danger of further postponing it, let the bishops and clergy unite in conceding an improved distribution of the three services in their use.

It is now very well known to all who choose to inform themselves that in all her Majesty's chapels the three services are never used together.

This oppression is still obstinately practised in most of the metropolitan churches; the prejudices of the pew-renters are preferred to the dictates of common sense and the necessities of the weak and infirm.

Those who think that what has been must necessarily be continued, either sit the repetitions out, or do not because they cannot attend the service of the Church at all.

In this dilemma I invariably take my hat and walk deliberately out at the end of the Litany, and return for the Lord's Supper when I frequent that ordinance. Thus others might do, as a timely lesson to those who need it.

I beg to submit the few foregoing observations respectfully in reply to your application to me, and to say that I ardently hope Dissent may increase until the waste of money now practised in the building of spires in towns and cities now replete with them shall be amended, and until the services of the Church are adapted (without reference to the mode or times of Charles II.) to the wants of scriptural Christians who belong to the Church of England.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

London, Nov. 18.

We are glad to see that Messrs. Sampson Low & Son announce a new romance, entitled "The Old House in Crosby Square," by Mr. Henry Holl, the author of "The King's Mail," lately reviewed in our columns. It is promised at the end of the month.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

BATTLEFIELDS OF THE SOUTH.*

THIS book is said to be written by "An English Combatant," nor do we desire to cast any doubt upon the literal truth of this statement. At the same time, we do not admit the inference which it is calculated to suggest. Our author may belong to a neutral nation, but he is no neutral in feeling. He sympathizes warmly with the South, in whose armies he has fought, and his testimony must be received as that of an enthusiastic partisan. But although we cannot accept his narrative as an impartial account of the transactions which it relates, this detracts but little from its value. It is too early to expect an impartial history of any part of the great civil war which is yet in progress. All that we can reasonably look for at present are spirited and intelligent narratives of military events as they appeared to those who took part in them on the one side or the other. Such memoirs must be coloured by the passions and prepossessions of the hour; they form the materials for history rather than history itself. With this qualification, the merits of the work before us are considerable. The author was an eye-witness of some of the most interesting portions of the struggle, and his duties, either as a line or a staff officer, brought him in contact with most of the distinguished Confederate leaders. He writes clearly and describes graphically, and although we may occasionally suspect him of partiality or see that his information is imperfect, he impresses us with a belief that he intends to tell the truth, so far as he knows it. A proof of his sincerity is afforded by the candour with which he describes the merits and the defects of the Confederate armies. He presents them to us with all the shortcomings which we should expect in forces so levied, and with all the faults of organization which are inevitable in the sudden gathering of hasty levies. The Federals are fond of telling us that the treachery of Mr. Floyd, Buchanan's Secretary at War, placed within the power of the South the weapons and matériel sufficient for the armament of a large force. They are also prone to account for their own early defeats by crediting their opponents with a more sagacious foresight of the impending struggle, and with a more perfect organization of the means for supporting it. If, however, we may rely upon our author (and his statements are certainly recommended to our credence by their inherent probability) the military stores of the late United States, which had been removed South before the secession, were nearly all of old and effete patterns, while the early levies of the South were quite as hastily drilled and as badly officered as were those of the North. It may be true that the majority of the officers of the old United States army were natives of the South, and followed the fortunes of the States to which they belonged. But they were far too few to leaven the mass of raw recruits, and the North derived more than an adequate compensation in the number of German and other foreign officers whose services they obtained. Mr. Jefferson Davis and a few long-headed politicians may have foreseen that secession was inevitable, but they had no opportunity of providing for it in a military sense. The first armies of the South were hastily formed of companies raised in different localities, grouped together in regiments, from circumstances in a great measure accidental, and officered by that worst of all possible modes of selection, popular election. The military virtues of the rank and file were largely counterbalanced by the vices of insubordination and drunkenness. The medical service was very imperfect, and the commissariat seems to have been little better than our own in the early days of the Crimean war. The process of making a good army out of the raw materials at hand was as slow and as gradual as it has ever been found under similar circumstances. That the work was accomplished at last under the greatest possible disadvantages is due to the energy and ability of a few remarkable men, amongst whom General Lee is probably entitled to the first place, and to the gallantry and self-devotion with which the Southerners faced the perils of the field, and endured the still more harassing privations to which they were subjected from bad food, insufficient clothing, and incessant marching. These armies have only attained by slow degrees their present discipline and organization; and more than once in the course of the struggle the most brilliant successes have proved fruitless, because, as is the case with all raw armies, they melted into a mob under the excitement of victory. It is important to bear this in mind, because it is only by forming a just estimate of the difficulties which have been overcome that we can appreciate the latent strength which is still available to meet future emergencies. Although the work before us does not treat the subject in a formal manner, it throws much incidental light upon the interesting subject of the formation of the Confederate army.

The author appears to have taken part in most of the important operations of the war, either as lieutenant of artillery or as an officer on the staff. He was at the battle of Bull's Run; he was present at the engagement of Leesburg or Ball's Bluff; he fought through the campaign on the Chickahominy; and after taking part in the memorable engagements which resulted in the expulsion of Pope from the Shenandoah Valley, he was with the Confederate army at Antietam, and closed his career, so far as the present volumes bring it down, with the battle of Fredericksburg. But besides his personal experiences, we have narratives contributed by corre-

* Battle-fields of the South, from Bull Run to Fredericksburg; with Sketches of Confederate Commanders, and Gossip of the Camps. By An English Combatant (Lieutenant of Artillery on the Field Staff). With two maps. Two vols. London: Smith, Elder, & Co.

spondents from other parts of the scene of war. Amongst them the most interesting furnish accounts of the operations in Missouri, of the battle of Shiloh, and of the first campaign of Jackson in the Shenandoah Valley. It is obviously impossible within the limits of a review to sketch even in the most desultory manner operations so varied, extending over such an immense surface, and furnishing the materials of half-a-dozen active campaigns. We cannot even enter upon any description of the celebrated campaign on the Chickahominy, the greater part of which was witnessed by "T. E. C.," while the remainder is detailed from accounts furnished to him soon after the events by those who were actually present at them. As a contribution to the military history of the war this is certainly the most valuable part of the work; while the clear and spirited description of the various movements and engagements is rendered easily intelligible to the non-professional reader by the aid of a very good sketch map. That McClellan was both out-generalled and out-fought is well known; but he has hitherto obtained great credit for his successful retreat to Harrison's Landing. Nor can it be denied that this operation was conducted both with skill and coolness, but if we may believe the author the Federal commander only succeeded in bringing off the remains of his magnificent force through the mismanagement of the Confederate General, Magruder. Had either Longstreet, Jackson, or Hill been in command of the division which came up with the Federals as they halted during their retreat on the strong position of Malvern Hills, it is probable that the Southerners would have gained a decisive victory instead of merely conquering the position at a cost which disabled them from immediately advancing, and left the Federals to pursue unmolested their march to the banks of the James's river. As it was, however, the Confederate success was very complete. The army opposed to them was completely demoralized by defeat and by the sickness which they had contracted in the unhealthy localities where their opponents had compelled them to encamp. General Lee estimated the loss of his antagonist at forty or more field-guns and several siege pieces, several dozen caissons and ammunition waggons, together with 30,000 stand of arms fit for use. Their killed, wounded, and prisoners, the author gives at nearly 60,000 men. On the other hand, the Confederates admit a loss during the same campaign of 15,000 killed, wounded, and missing. The balance was still more decidedly in favour of the South in the operations which soon afterwards followed in the Shenandoah valley. And although Lee failed in his subsequent invasion of Maryland, the capture of Harper's Ferry, which Jackson effected under cover of this movement, placed the Confederates in possession of artillery and military stores to an extent which far more than compensated them for any loss which they incurred. In spite of McClellan's partial success at the battle of Antietam, he was obviously no match for Lee. At the same time, even his opponents admit that he displayed the conduct of a soldier and some of the talents of a commander. Not so of Pope or Burnside. Every addition to our information places in a stronger light the imbecility of these favourites of President Lincoln and General Halleck. It is impossible even now to read the account which our author gives of the battle of Fredericksburg, without feeling the bitterest indignation at the manner in which brave men were consigned to inevitable destruction by the stolid obstinacy of the latter general. Neither of these generals appear to have inspired their antagonists with the slightest respect.

Amongst the most interesting things in these volumes are numerous interesting and lifelike sketches of the principal Confederate commanders and statesmen. President Davis, General Lee, and "Stonewall" Jackson have been so often described that their personal appearance must by this time be known to every newspaper reader. There is more novelty, at any rate, in the portraits of General Stuart and General Joe Johnson, for which we will therefore make room:—

"He (that is Stuart) appeared much fatigued and overworked, and would have served admirably for a picture of Dick Turpin when chased by officers on the road to York. His horse was a splendid black, with heavy reins and bit, cavalry saddle, and holsters; foam stood in a lather upon him, and he was mud-splashed from head to hoof. Stuart himself wore no insignia of command: a common black felt hat, turned down in front and up behind; a heavy black overcoat, tightly buttoned; elegant riding-boots covering the thigh; a handsome sabre, carelessly slung by his side, and a heavy pair of Mexican spurs, that jingled and rattled on the pavements, were all I could see of this splendid horseman and dashing leader. Thickset, full-faced, close-cut hair, and ruddy complexion, he looked more like Ainsworth's 'gentleman of the road' than a young, daring cavalry chief of thirty summers. . . .

"As Johnson stands conversing with General Griffiths of the Mississippi Brigade, we have a full view of that well-known officer. He is uncovered, and his small compact head is finely developed. His hair is grey, and cut close; his deep-set grey eyes are full of meaning; his features calm as those of a Jesuit; his complexion is ruddy; he wears military whiskers, and no moustaches; his uniform is of a grey colour, with facings of light orange and stars on the throat. In manner he is decided and unequivocal; short, sharp, and dry in conversation; decision of character is plainly seen in the close-set lips: altogether, he is a spruce, neat, compact little man. Although there are no signs of extraordinary intellect, or marks of a man 'truly great,' his quiet smile and twinkling eye betray a person of disciplined tastes and habits, possessed of much craftiness and cunning. I saw little of him around Manassas, but at Yorktown lines he was continually on the move, riding one of the finest chesnut mares the eye ever beheld; a small, active, wiry, fine-blooded, and swift animal, much like the owner. His solicitude was sleepless, and though visiting the principal

redoubts and points daily, I have known him to gallop into our battery near midnight not five minutes after the alarm-gun fired, and though the distance ridden was over a mile."

There has been from time to time much speculation as to the part which the Southern negroes were likely to take in the war; and many very contradictory statements as to their actual conduct. According to our author, they have (as might have been expected by any one who understood their character), nearly always remained faithful to their masters, whose animosity against the Yankees they seem, indeed, to have imbibed to no small extent. Amongst many amusing stories of which they form the subject, we must confine ourselves to the following account of their conduct at the battle of Leesburg:—

"At the commencement of the action our men perceived among the enemy several negroes, who seemed to take great care of themselves, and could not be induced to leave the trees behind which they fought. Many of us took a 'pop' at the darkies, but always missed. When the fact became known to our coloured boys, who always persisted in going to battle with us, they dropped the wounded they were carrying off, and immediately formed plans for capturing 'de black 'Bolition teeves.' It was very amusing to see their display of generalship. 'Go back to the rear, boys,' said the officers, 'this is no place for you!' But the darkies would not go back, and, lurking behind their masters, picked off the enemy's officers at a rapid rate. At last the regiment made a sudden charge, when, to our surprise, we found that not less than half a dozen black fellows had preceded us, and were each bringing out a prisoner of the same colour, abusing them roundly, and kicking them unmercifully. 'You black rascal you!—does you mean to fight agin white folks, you ugly niggers you? Suppose you tinks yourselves no 'small taters' wid dat blue jacket on, and dem striped pants. You'll oblige dis Mississippi darkey by pulling dem off right smart, if yer doesn't want dat head o' yourn broke!' 'You are a mighty smart nigger, you is!' said one of our cooks to his captive; 'comin' down Souf to whip de whites! You couldn't stay 't home and let us fight de Yanks, but you must come along too, eh! You took putty good care o' yourself, you did, behind dat ole oak! I was lookin' at yer; and if you hadn't dodged so much, you was a gone chicken long ago, you ugly old Abe Lincolnite, you!'"

Upon the whole we can heartily recommend this book as a contribution both valuable and interesting to the history of the American civil war. As we have already said, it does not pretend to impartiality, but we see no reason to doubt that it conveys with fidelity, as it certainly does with spirit, the honest impressions of a competent and intelligent observer.

QUEENS OF SONG.*

IN these days of departmental biography, when every class has its special records, from kings, queens, princes, and princesses, down to actors, fiddlers, conjurers, and quacks, an historian might find less worthy occupation than to collect the memoirs of those gifted songstresses whose names are intimately associated with the art of which they were the interpreters. A collection of such memoirs, in chronological order, was a want in musical biography which the present work is designed to supply.

The triumphs of the popular singer, like those of the great actor, are transient and fleeting as the breath of the public which applauds; and should their vocal or histrionic skill fail them, a new candidate supplants the former favourite, whose imagined golden future has too frequently resolved itself into the hard realities of present poverty. The uncertainties and vicissitudes of such a career should be largely taken into account when considering the enormous rewards and exaggerated fame which have been lavished on some public favourites. The direct appeal which executive art makes to the senses of the crowd, must always give it a large temporary advantage over the unseen creative genius on whose thought the artist exists. It seems shocking that while a Farinelli revels in luxury and splendour a Beethoven may starve; but in this, as in many other matters, "time brings in his revenges," and Farinelli becomes but a name, while Beethoven is a reality for all time. Nor should it be forgotten that while, on the one hand, the singer has often shone by the borrowed splendour of the composer's genius, on the other it has frequently happened that brilliant executive talent has shed a false radiance over music that, without such aid, would have fallen into instant obscurity. A long chapter might be written on the influences exercised by singers upon music; and such an inquiry could scarcely fail to result in showing that, as regards the purity of the art and its intellectual development, such influence has frequently been rather detrimental than otherwise. The tendency to exhibit individual executive powers is always apt to lead to an excessive display of the mastery over mechanical difficulties as an end rather than a means.

The early Italian opera, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, presented but little contrast to the music of the Church—the principal form of secular composition which preceded dramatic music, the madrigal, was almost identical with the Church style, being composed for a combination of voices, and its chief difference being an occasional greater liveliness of tempo. The earliest form of the opera consisted of a series of short choruses, with a few

* *Queens of Song*; being Memoirs of some of the most celebrated Female Vocalists who have appeared on the Lyric Stage, from the earliest days of Opera to the present time. To which is added a list of all the operas that have been performed in Europe. By Ellen Creathorne Clayton. In 2 vols. With six portraits. London: Smith, Elder, & Co.

fragmentary snatches of recitative and (so-called) air—crude and unshapely in form, and possessing no continuity of thought or prolonged musical interest. Dramatic expression was but slowly introduced in the gradual development of the opera, when individual passions and feelings were to be expressed by solo singers. Then it was that vocalization began to be cultivated as a special art; and the operas of the greater part of the eighteenth century are reflective both of the composer's efforts at the expression of impulsive feeling and the restraining influence of the vocalist's mechanical art—the most dramatic situations frequently giving way to rapid roulades and formal sequences of notes which formed the basis of the solo singer's studies. Handel himself, notwithstanding the force and originality of his genius, was largely subject to this influence, not only in his operas but even in his oratorios, where his sublime choral writing is sometimes in extraordinary juxtaposition with florid songs containing passages of mere display which are more like extracts from the singer's book of studies than inherent portions of a great work. Our own Purcell, too, in some of his anthems, exhibits similar instances of this subordination of idea to the singer's mechanical display. Gluck was the first to oppose this, among other conventional absurdities of the opera, and these abuses of the art of vocalization are particularly alluded to in the thoughtful and philosophic dedicatory epistle prefixed to his opera of "Alceste." Mozart, on the other hand, with all his transcendent genius, was too apt, in the facile geniality of his nature, to minister to the vanity of solo singers, and occasionally to approach those abuses of the vocal art which "the excessive complaisance of composers had introduced into the Italian opera," as Gluck truly expresses it. Various instances of this are to be found in Mozart's operas, one of the most glaring examples being the song of the Queen of Night in the "Zauberflöte," which is overlaid with a series of passages of mere mechanical display, that have the effect rather of a formal exercise than a piece of dramatic expression. The composers of the modern Italian school, however, have most to answer for in this submission to vocal egotism; and as the greater the endowments the higher the responsibility, Rossini, with a genius comparable in some respects to that of Mozart, has sinned most deeply. Setting aside some few of his operas, among which exceptions "Il Barbiere" and "Tell" are of course above all criticism, many of his works are little else than mere vehicles for the display of florid vocal mechanism, in which the text is the basis on which the singers engraft their favourite roulades and cadenzas. Of what value in literature would be a dramatic work in which the authorship consists chiefly in indicating opportunities for what (in theatrical slang) is termed the "gag" of popular actors? Yet this is precisely what a great portion of modern Italian music is. Beethoven and Weber have been much assailed for the noble stand which they made against the frivolous vocal taste of the day; and by treating vocalization as subordinate to the expression of the composer's idea, they have incurred the lasting enmity of those singers who think more of their own "most sweet voices" than of the higher intellectual purpose of art. Of the many popular vocal performers, past and present, but few have attained that real greatness which consists in something more than a fine voice and voluble execution; and the preceding remarks have been offered with a view to show that many of the "Queens of Song" have abused their sovereignty and been in reality tyrants and despots over composers and their art.

The volumes which have led us into these remarks contain memoirs of upwards of forty celebrated female singers of Italy, France, England, and Germany; beginning with Catherine Tofts and Margarita de l'Epine, the rival songstresses of Addison's day; and concluding with the great singers of the present hour. The authoress has confined herself chiefly to historical facts and dates industriously compiled from various authorities,—the few critical opinions that are given being mostly extracts from the public journals. Among the large number of songstresses whose biographies are narrated, some are scarcely entitled to be considered as "Queens" of song, being, indeed, little more than Princesses of the art. In a work of this kind, however, there must, of course, be choice and selection; it is always difficult to draw the line of admission or rejection, and it would be easy to specify several omitted names quite as worthy of record as some that are included. The book is illustrated with portraits of Mrs. Billington, Mesdames Pasta, Grisi, Malibran, Viardot Garcia, and Clara Novello—mostly excellent likenesses.

The work is got up in a style worthy of the eminent house from which it emanates, and is well adapted for a gift-book among musical amateurs. We must, however, point out some blunders in the appended lists of operas and composers, which the smallest amount of musical knowledge should have rendered impossible. At page 421, vol. ii., we are informed, "In addition to the Fall of the Giants," Gluck composed about forty-five operas during his stay in London (1745 to 1763). Now Gluck (not Glück as the authoress persists in calling him) arrived here in 1745, produced his "Caduta de' giganti" and two or three smaller works, and left England at the close of 1746. In 1747 he was producing an opera in Germany, and from that period his career was limited to that country, Italy, and France. How, therefore, such a mis-statement as that in the book before us can have occurred is difficult to conceive. Again, in the chronological list of "all the operas that have appeared in Europe" under the names of their respective composers, no mention whatever is made of the works of Keiser. It is true his name appears in the list of composers, "not pre-eminent as operatic writers." Not pre-eminent as an operatic writer! Why,

Keiser, although he produced some church music, was famous only for his operas, of which he produced upwards of a hundred, mostly at Hamburg, which at the commencement of the last century was as much a musical centre as Paris in later times; and as to "pre-eminence," the celebrity of Keiser was as great in his day as that of Rossini or Bellini in ours. Handel formed his operatic style on that of Keiser, and in the works of the latter, many of which are preserved in the Royal Library at Berlin, are examples of exquisite grace and masterly power quite worthy of his better known disciple. Again, merely the name of Marschner is mentioned among those "not pre-eminent," &c., while in the list of composers whose works are specified in detail (and some of them the smallest of the small) he is altogether ignored. Now, Marschner, although he wrote much chamber music, is almost entirely celebrated for his operas; one of which "Der Vampyr," achieved a European celebrity, and should at least have entitled its composer to a place in a catalogue which includes some vastly inferior names. In the list of Meyerbeer's works, he is credited with operas under the titles of "Nabuco," "Attila," and "Giovanni d'Arco," subjects which Verdi has treated, but Meyerbeer certainly has not. Mendelssohn, Schubert, Lortzing, and other names of composers, all of whom have produced operas, are omitted altogether from both lists; and other similar errors might be specified for which there is no excuse, and which should be corrected in any future issue of the book.

MODERN PANTHEISM.*

THE name of M. Emile Saisset, the translator of Spinoza, is familiar to most readers who bestow on the works of the spiritual school of philosophy in France the attention which is their due. He is a worthy contemporary of such men as M. Pressensé, Jules Simon, and (in spite of his heterodoxy) E. Renan. In almost every French writer on high subjects we have the charm afforded by clearness of thought, quickness of sympathy, vivacity of style, enhanced, too, by the peculiar aptitude of the French language for philosophical expression; but in the above-mentioned thinkers there is, over and above all this, a tone of religious earnestness, a purity of moral feeling, and an eagerness in the pursuit of truth, which we rarely see combined to the same degree in the disciples of Kant, Hegel, or Sir W. Hamilton. The work which we would introduce to our readers' notice is a translation of M. Saisset's "Essai de Philosophie Religieuse." The original draft of the essay obtained the prize offered by the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences on the following subject, "Examen Critique des Principaux Systèmes Modernes de Théodicée;" and the second edition carried off the first of the great Monthyon prizes of the French Academy. The translation seems to us well executed; a running analysis upon the margin is of great help to the reader; and a few foot-notes have been added from the pen of the translator, which indicate a line of study and thought qualifying him to be the English interpreter of M. Saisset.

In an admirable introduction the author of the essay informs us how he was led to the consideration of the problems discussed in his treatise. He represents himself as setting out, about twenty years ago, to form his own philosophical and religious opinions. It was a remarkable period in the history of French thought. Before Madame de Staël published her famous "L'Allemagne," German literature and philosophy was unknown and despised in the exclusive salons of Paris. From that time German ideas began to spread in all departments of history, criticism, and philosophy; and their influence, perhaps, was never so high as when M. Saisset thought himself "entitled to emancipate himself from every species of tutelage," and construct a creed of his own. It was no wonder that the admiring readers of Hegel and Fichte became the votaries of Pantheism; and the preachers and theologians of the day did not much mend matters by declaring that between Pantheism and the Roman Catholic faith there was no intermediate position. Our author, though a passionate lover of philosophy, as he tells us, had no predilection for Pantheism. A Christian education, combined with an early partiality for the works of Plato and St. Augustin, had deeply impressed him with the belief of the Divine personality and providence. His candour, however, led him to the examination of the system of Pantheism in the writings of its greatest modern teacher, Spinoza; he also studied it in some of its ancient forms; and only paused when he fancied he had detected its leading idea and its radical flaw. This last seemed to him to clothe itself in the form of a dilemma, on one of the horns of which every consistent Pantheist must be suspended—

Either your God is all in such sort that there is and that there can be but one only person, one sole individual, who is God; or your God is only a dead and unreal abstraction, in such sort that there are no real beings but the finite and determined beings who compose nature.

On one hypothesis man's personality was annihilated; on the other, God's. We should have imagined that M. Saisset's study of Pantheistic writers would have already led him to see that compelling them to the denial of God's personality was very far from refuting them by a *reductio ad absurdum*. Further examination appears to have opened his eyes on this point; and it was his discovery that contemporary Pantheism is nothing less than Atheism in profession or disguise, that prompted him to review the

* Essays on Religious Philosophy. By M. Emile Saisset. Translated. Two vols. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

whole system, to weigh all the arguments against Theism, and to place on a firm basis the one great doctrine of the personality of God. "I merely relate" (he says) "how, after traversing difficulties, doubts, anxieties, and all the trials inseparable from free examination, I have come to satisfy my mind upon the essential points of religion, and to possess my soul in peace."

But the subject is one deriving interest not only from the confessions of one inquiring spirit. M. Saisset's work is of value as indicating the tendencies of the age, and showing how the most opposite modes of thought may converge towards extinguishing or obscuring the main antidote to Pantheism—the idea of a personal God. If it is correct to say that the system of Pantheism requires the annihilation either of the Divine or human personality, we may easily gather from the spirit and tendencies of our age which of the two it would be inclined to sacrifice. The strong sentiment of man's individuality, the craving for outward activity, the consciousness of power over nature, and the boundless thirst for terrestrial enjoyments, so characteristic of our time, repel at once the mystical Pantheism that would absorb man in God, while they find a congenial doctrine in the atheistical Pantheism of Hegel and Feuerbach, which make man everything and God nothing. This being so, we naturally turn to see what position the philosophers and the theologians of the day occupy toward the movement. The Positivists will neither affirm nor deny the existence of God; as that cannot be reduced to facts and laws, they will have nothing to say to the matter. The disciples of Sir W. Hamilton go a little further than these: Man (they allow) is so constituted that nothing finite can suffice him: he is to long and struggle and aspire towards the perfect and the infinite; but to grasp the idea, determine the nature and attributes of God, this is beyond the tether of his mental powers; he must let this alone for ever. The theologians disparage reason still more: Not only is it inadequate in Divine matters, not only is it incapable of apprehending God, it is even an obstacle to the clear intuitions of faith. The Bampton Lectures of 1858 were a fine sample of this mode of treatment. Religion as based on the idea of God's nature and perfections was there overthrown, and the edifice of religious consciousness was rebuilt on the feeling of dependence and the conviction of moral obligation, without any conception of the Being on whom man depended and to whom he was bound! Thus, to the inherent tendencies of our time are added the various doctrines of philosophical and religious schools, all combining in their different ways to "obscure and efface the holy and truly natural idea of a personal God, the free and intelligent Creator of the universe, the Judge and Father of the human race."

Accordingly, we cannot but welcome M. Saisset's book as reasonable no less than interesting. The whole subject is handled with great ability, thorough knowledge, and a generous enthusiasm. It consists of two parts—the first critical and historical, the second constructive. He begins by tracing the arguments for Theism in its most powerful advocates, Descartes, Malebranche, Newton, and Leibnitz, and then proceeds to set over against these the Pantheistic systems of Spinoza, Kant, Fichte, and Hegel. These sketches constitute unquestionably the most valuable portion of the book; we only wish that M. Saisset had made his treatise still more complete by a notice of the origin and growth of Pantheism in the Eleatic and Alexandrian schools of ancient times, especially as he tells us in his Introduction that he had pushed his inquiries in this direction. We imagine that the speculations of Parmenides and Plotinus would be no bad preparation for encountering the drier yet maturer dogmas of Spinoza and his followers; still, what our author has done, he has done well. We cannot, perhaps, better describe his merits in this part of his work than in the words of his translator:—

"I thank him for a noble testimony of reason to the personality of God. He has drawn out clearly the central idea of Pantheism. He has analysed its metaphysics from Spinoza to Hegel, gliding subtly along its finest threads. He has shown that Pantheism is founded upon deductions from that experience which it condemns; that its vaunted premisses are word-jugglings, false to the verge of madness; that it promises the soul an ocean of light to lead it into an abyss of darkness without morality, immortality, or God; for its morality is a fancy, its immortality is death, and its God is the negation of God. He has done this not merely by demonstrating the impotence of human reason which might lead us down another abyss, but with metaphysical good sense as well as subtlety showing that God is light as well as darkness, and that reason has its strength as well as its weakness. Nor have his services ended there. He has displayed to us all the great proofs for the existence of God, not isolated as in Descartes or Paley, not sneered down with offensive contempt, as only suitable for childhood, but ringed together like adamant. I have to thank him too for many lights thrown upon nature and upon the mind and condition of man" (Vol. II. p. 226).

The second, or constructive portion of M. Saisset's treatise does not strike us as equal in value to the first. It consists of nine "Meditations" on the chief problems which Pantheism undertakes to solve, and its failure in the solution of which had been established by our author in the critical review comprised in the first part. Such questions as—"Is there a God? Is God accessible to reason? Can there be anything but God? Is the world infinite?"—these and others remain unanswered as yet, and M. Saisset proceeds to set forth his own views briefly on each. We can afford to give our readers only a very short notice of some of his opinions on these "high arguments." For example, the existence of God he prefers to establish not on the basis of a syllogism, like Descartes, but on an immediate intuition of the

consciousness; the soul, penetrated with the sense of its imperfection, turns to the Perfect Being, and finds in God alone the reason of its existence, which it cannot discover in itself. The essence of the Divine Being he holds of course to be inaccessible to reason; but this is not to deter man from thinking of Him. True! God's essence is incomprehensible, because it is incommunicable; but there is also something intelligible, because there is something communicable, viz., the powers of his being, thought, love, joy, and life. To those who tell him of the "inconceivability of the absolute" he makes this wise reply:—"I admit that such an absolute is in contradiction with the fundamental law of thought and being, that it is unthinkable to the human mind and to itself. But then this is but a vain abstraction, not the determined God, not the living God, who is intelligence, truth, and the eternal consciousness of thought." We must notice one more of our author's "Meditations" to express our disagreement with the opinion he arrives at; on the question, "Whether the universe is infinite and eternal," or is limited in space and time, he pronounces in favour of the former; and his premisses appear to us as unsatisfactory as the conclusions from them. The universe (says M. Saisset) is the image of God; it is only by this right that it exists; but as the finite and the transient cannot express the infinite and eternal, the *Kosmos* has what he terms a relative infinity. Now, will our author, who is particularly severe on the audacity of the German intellect in its attempts to give a universal and adequate explanation of all things, maintain, notwithstanding, that the mind is capable of deciding by what right the universe exists, and of pronouncing that anything short of an infinite universe would be only a "phantom of God's thought, an irony on His omnipotence?" The termination of the universe is doubtless all but inconceivable; but then equally so was its creation; and if M. Saisset accepts the latter, we do not see why he should stumble at the former. We cannot but think, though we would speak with much diffidence here, that our author is making the old confusion between the *infinite* and the *indefinite*. Because modern discoveries can detect twenty millions of stars in the milky way, or half as many animalcules in a pitcher of water, this surely only goes to prove the vastness—the indefinite but not the infinite extent—of the universe; it establishes that *we can set no limits* to it, not that *it has no limits at all*. Besides, the same line of reasoning would require that the universe should be perfect; an imperfect *Kosmos* would as little be the image of a Perfect Being as a finite creation of an Infinite Creator. Then what becomes of evil, sin, suffering, death? Either these must be denied, and so common sense and experience be shocked, or else they must be held to be so many phases of good, and M. Saisset must go farther than Hegel, and maintain that sin is necessary to produce good, and affliction to produce happiness. We should be very sorry to have misunderstood or misinterpreted M. Saisset's views on this point; yet we cannot but think that on this and one or two other questions his own mind has been somewhat coloured by his studies of Pantheism. After all, no system is wholly wrong; and we can hardly wonder if so liberal and sympathetic a spirit as M. Saisset's should have imbibed some of the higher conceptions and nobler tendencies of the school, which he has on the whole refuted with such success. We may add that our author is a hearty believer in Revelation; and the devout spirit pervading the entire treatise cannot be better illustrated than by the beautiful sentence which closes his last "Meditation":—"The great mystery of existence, the distinction and union of the two personalities (the great question of Pantheism)—this mystery where pure reason is lost, where reasoning so often goes astray—this mystery does not exist to the soul that has prayed."

GREECE AND THE IONIAN ISLANDS.*

THE learned Professor of geology has published the results of his vacation tour, which come very *à propos* to throw light upon a subject that happens just now to be of the highest importance. The scientific part of the work, which is of great interest, as might be well expected from one so competent to speak of the geological and physical conditions of the "Isles of Greece," as is Professor D. T. Ansted, we are compelled from lack of space to leave aside for a time, trusting to return to it at some future period. We plunge at once in *medias res*, and take our stand on what our neighbours call "*le terrain brûlant*,"—the present condition and future prospects of Greece,—more especially with regard to the questions raised by England's renunciation of the Ionian protectorate and her cession of the islands constituting the Septinsular Republic to the future kingdom of Greece. It was on the probability of cession becoming apparent that Professor Ansted felt it would be interesting in every way to visit them before so great a change should take place:—

"I should see a country preparing for a peaceful revolution. I should be able to judge in some measure what England had done, how she had fulfilled the responsible office she had undertaken, and what was the probability of her plans being carried out, and how far there was reason for the unpopularity of British government in the National Assembly that had been so long notorious."

The result of this judicial investigation is the conclusion of the author, that "although, at present, even-handed justice is dealt to all, it must be admitted, to the disgrace of our country, that such has not always been the case. Giving too much power into the

* The Ionian Islands in the year 1863. By Professor D. T. Ansted, M.A., F.R.S. London: W. H. Allen & Co.

hands of the old oligarchy, and shutting their eyes to the almost inevitable consequences, the authorities for a long time chose to govern indirectly by the oligarchy, instead of looking out for right men to fill important posts. A great deal of injustice has certainly been committed by the nominees of the English Government, that no Englishman at head-quarters had the smallest idea of. It is not a pleasant reflection that what England has done for and in the Ionian Islands during the half century they have been under her protection has not tended to bring out much of the better part of the national character of the people. It is clear that, had the islands been fairly and reasonably governed from the beginning of our rule, they could not exhibit so small a result. English Governments have made roads which the natives seem hardly inclined to keep in repair; they have supplied the towns with water, and they have greatly improved the streets, the public buildings, the harbours, and the defences; they have latterly taught the people to respect and understand justice; they have, as a Government, dealt with perfect fairness to all classes; and they have done much to check both lawless violence and that perpetual litigation which is so common in the south of Europe generally. In all these respects they have attended to the material wants of the people, and deserve credit accordingly. On the other hand, they have not till lately so encouraged general education among all classes as to strengthen the intellectual character of the people. They have in fact kept all classes in the condition of children, so that they are not much more fitted to conduct their own affairs than they were half a century ago. By too soon granting them the power to do themselves harm, and by checking useful measures, they have altogether stopped the progress that would by this time have altered the whole state of society; and more than ten years were absolutely wasted owing to the incompetency of Lord High Commissioners appointed to superintend the affairs of the country. Such is the indictment which Professor Ansted prefers against his country, or rather, such is the judgment he delivers upon the way in which she has discharged her duties as protectress of the Ionian Republic. Mr. Ansted, who advocates a dictatorship and a little tyranny, forgets that England will not do evil that good may come. It is no article in her creed that *la fin justifie les moyens*, and all his reproaches levelled against her have their foundation in a wrong estimate of the duties of a State. The English notions of government, constitutional and parliamentary, are not those of the author. We conceive that the office and functions of government are purely material. The State is not to educate, not to keep the consciences of, nor to confess, nor to instruct in morality, the public. That is for the public to do themselves; but the duty of the State is to administer public affairs, afford facilities for trade, protect commerce, life, and property, and secure the pure administration of justice. This Professor Ansted admits the protecting Power has fully done in the Ionian Islands; anything beyond would be *de l'arbitraire* and unconstitutional.

We now come to the question of the cession of the islands and their annexation to the kingdom of Greece. So far as ourselves are concerned, we think it a good riddance. No one with the slightest experience of the Levant but is fully aware that our Ionian fellow-subjects are the pest and nuisance of our consulates, the cause of ninety-nine out of a hundred of our disputes with the local Government, and the authors of most of the murders, robberies, rapes, and crimes that disgrace Constantinople and the Levantine seaboard towns. We have the proud satisfaction of knowing that the cross of Cressy, Blenheim, Waterloo, and Trafalgar is made to cover with its glorious *prestige* and protection the vilest of mankind to be found in all the East. We may well rejoice at a severance of the connection. What and who are the Ionian or Septinsular Greeks? Let the author tell us. The census of 1857 gives the total population at 226,824 souls.

The society of the islands, when they first came under English management, seems to have involved in each a separate oligarchy, consisting of old Venetian families, and a *plebs* made up of a mixed race of Albanians, Greeks from various islands, Slaves from the east, and Italians from the west coast of the Adriatic. In the town of Corfu not one-third of the population is composed of Greeks, and of them only a small number of families are educated and well provided for. With few exceptions, they would probably demur to immediate annexation. One-third of the inhabitants are Jews, who are well treated, and allowed every liberty, but who, in Greece, will not be able to retain their position, and will probably be subjected to persecution. Aware of this, they would not of themselves desire a change, but, timid by nature, they will hardly dare oppose it. The remaining third are foreigners. Some of them may be expected to advocate change for the love of change, but they would certainly suffer by the transfer. As for the Ionians being descendants of the Greeks, they are no more so than we are the sons of the ancient Britons. That Zante, Cephalonia, and Ithaca, were depopulated by the Turks, that most parts of Corfu and Santa Maura were similarly desolated, and that the old Greek element, if it exist at all, is confined to Leucadia, is beyond all doubt. Consequently they are mixed, with no more claim to a Greek descent, than ex-Alderman Higgins has to a Norman. To the claims of true nationality Englishmen will always pay the greatest respect and attention; on such a bastard origin as this we can only look with indifference. If the Ionians desire annexation, and to be the progenitor of a noble offspring, it is just as we see the son of some illiterate *parvenu* annex the wizen, ugly, poverty-stricken daughter of Earl Baccres for the sake of the noble connection. The truth is the Ionians are the dupes of their own vanity and of Russian

intrigues. Continental Greece, greedy of territorial aggrandizement, has manœuvred, by aid of Russian gold and priestcraft, to make the Ionian *corbeau* dissatisfied with its condition, and long for the light burden of Greek taxation, the honesty of Greek finance, and the impartiality of Greek justice. The wish of the Ionians is on the eve of being granted. Should they hereafter complain of being deceived, there will be no remedy. By their turbulence and their ingratitude they have dug an impassable gulf between us, they have broken down the bridge behind them, and where they are they must stay. Any prayers to be received back again will meet with a stern denial.

CHRISTMAS GIFT BOOKS.

WE noticed last week some almanacks heralding the new year. We have now to deal with symptoms of Christmas. Before the poulterers have hung out a single turkey tricked with delicate ribands of all hues; before the butchers have been able to exhibit a pound of prize beef; or the grocers to emblazon their windows with any of their multifarious contributions to the feasting and indigestion of the coming season, the publishers are ready with their books, in gold and green, gold and crimson, gold and every colour of the rainbow; with rare devices on the outside and beautiful engravings within; delicate shrines of works written by the famous men of our day, and worthy to lie on the tables of princes.

Take first, "Our English Lakes, Mountains, and Waterfalls."* In this book we have a poetical guide to the lake scenery of Cumberland and Westmoreland, the cicerone being Wordsworth, from whose writings the compiler has selected illustrative passages, classifying his extracts under the heads of the different lakes or other objects of interest in each locality. The idea is excellent, and has been ably carried out. Only a poet could interpret such scenes and sing their praise; and not even a poet could celebrate them as Wordsworth did, unless, like him, he had lived in long communion with them. To aid the less imaginative reader and add to the beauty of his volume, Mr. Bennett has given us some choice photographic illustrations contributed by Mr. T. Ogle. If then any one desires to conciliate a fair poetical friend, let him go to her with this book in hand. Or if the lady is of an antiquarian turn of mind, it might be better to present her with William Howitt's "Ruined Abbeys and Castles,"† from the shelves of the same publisher, bound in gold and green, with chaste armorial bearings, with photographic illustrations by Thompson, Sedgfield, Ogle, and Hemphill. Here she will read the History of Kenilworth Castle, and Amy Robsart; of Carnarvon Castle and its royal associations; of the Priory of Lindisfarne, Tynemouth Priory, Whitby Abbey, Netley Abbey, and a dozen other abbeys and castles which have played notable parts in the history of our land. It is unnecessary to say anything of Mr. Howitt's merits in this work. They are already admitted. We have to deal only with the publisher, printer, illustrators, and bookbinder, who amongst them have turned out a volume whose beauty we lack words sufficiently to commend. We turn next to Professor Aytoun's "Lays of the Scottish Cavaliers;"‡ whose literary merits we have not to discuss, since they, too, are acknowledged. We have to look at this quarto solely with a view to its effect as it will lie on hundreds of tables. The publishers would prefer that it should lie on thousands, and there is no reason why it should not, for they have done their best, and have done it well, to give the Professor's lays a dress and illustrations and binding worthy of them. The volume has a cavalier look, grand and solid; burnished as the cavaliers themselves might have been in their panoply; and the illustrations are as massive and dramatic as they are plentiful. And now let us wish "a merry Christmas" to the "Ingoldsby Legends,"§ for surely they will make merry the Christmas of all who read them, and the New Year, too, after what is left of the old one. Splendid in gold and green, illustrated by three of our best humourists, binding, printing, and even illustrations of the highest excellence—as they all are—must give way to the legends themselves. Never was lighter, airier, happier humour; fun rollicking in wonderful gambols; provoking laughter even to tears, with an indefinable poetic grace, the whole perfectly delightful. Of the illustrations it is impossible to say too much. Of the whole book, if we have not said enough, let the reader buy it, and he will see that at least we do not say too much in assuring him that he will get more than full value for his money. "London People"|| is a reprint, with illustrations, from the *Cornhill Magazine*, bound in a neat volume and worthy to rank amongst Christmas gift-books, though it does not pretend to the material glories of those already mentioned. The descriptions are truthful and most able—three of them from the pen of Mr. John Hollingshead; and the illustrations fine examples of character-sketching, graphic and expressive.

* Our English Lakes, Mountains, and Waterfalls, as seen by William Wordsworth. Photographically illustrated. A. W. Bennett.

† Ruined Abbeys and Castles of Great Britain and Ireland. By William Howitt. Second Series. A. W. Bennett.

‡ Lays of the Scottish Cavaliers, and other Poems. By William Edmondstone Aytoun. With illustrations, by Joseph Noel Paton, R.S.A., and Walter H. Paton. William Blackwood & Sons.

§ The Ingoldsby Legends; or, Mirth and Marvels. By Thomas Ingoldsby, esquire. With sixty illustrations, by George Cruikshank, John Leech, and John Tenniel. Richard Bentley.

|| London People Sketched from Life. By Charles Bennett. Smith, Elder, & Co.

SHORT NOTICES.

CARNATIC CHRONOLOGY.*

In various English publications the chronological systems of all countries but those of India have been explained, and these are ancient, permanent, and oracular. Sir William Jones, Colebrook, and others who wrote in India, understood the methods, but did not explain them. The Hindu system is quite separate from the Mussulman, and five Hindu and two Mussulman methods are explained in this treatise, in tables which, in nineteen pages, give the number of every year for nearly five thousand years. But this is not all. The Hindus, like the Chinese and other nations in Eastern Asia, quote years by titles, and not by numerals. Thus, as is stated in the preface,—"Those who have had occasion to transact business with Hindus, or to translate documents written by them, often feel the want of a key to the various dates in use. For instance, a letter is dated 'On new moon, in (the month) Vaisakha, in (the year bearing the title) Chitrabhan.' This is in English the 20th of May, 1822. Or the date appears, 'the 13th of the bright fortnight in (the month) Sravana in (the year named) Saumya.' This is equivalent to the 1st of August, 1849. The Madras newspaper, printed in the Telugu language on the 10th of April, 1850, is dated 'Year Sadharana, 13th of the wane in (the month) Chaitra.'" Bonds and other deeds are dated in the same manner.

There are sixty titles, counted in cycles. A.D. 1806 was the 60th, or closing year of the 81st Cycle. The year is named Acshaya; the next year is named Prabhana, the first of the next cycle. Such is the Hindu plan, grounded on astronomical calculations. The Hindus venerate antiquity and approve their own arbitrary and intricate method, even after understanding that used in Europe. In Hindu schools the list of titles is daily repeated backwards and forwards without numerals.

One circumstance has rendered the system perplexing, and this is remedied in the present volume. If the numeral is given it is sometimes true, sometimes false. And this has been the custom from the commencement. Thus, the Salivahana year 1119 (A.D. 1197) is the year Pingala, which title, in some inscriptions, is marked 1118. The next year, Kalayucti, is ss. 1120, but elsewhere has the numeral 1124. This is the more curious, as there is no error. The variation is intentional. The title is always exact, and the variation seldom exceeds two numerals. In this work the system of titles is, we believe, for the first time exhibited complete, by theory, calculated by Brahman astronomers, as far as A.D. 990, and after that by the evidence collected from numerous inscriptions. The Mussulman methods of counting years are also stated in this volume, from the earliest periods. Thus, A.D. 1857 is the Hejri year 1274, but the Fasby year 1266. The same year is named "Pingala;" and according to the Salivahana chronology it is 1779. In the Kali year of the world it is 4958. In the Kollam reckoning, used in Malabar, it is 1033. In the Samvat, used in Bombay, it is year 1914. All these are stated in a single line. There are also given in this work treatises explaining the symbolical method of recording dates, which Sir William Jones thought "wonderfully ingenious." Also a new system of technical memory. Genealogical notices of various families are also appended; and the book concludes with tables of events from the earliest recorded periods down to the present year. These—not mere reprints—exhibit the Hindu, Mussulman, Portuguese, and French invasions, the rise and decline of the dynasties, &c., the authorities being always specified. The tables include the successive conquests of the various powers who have held portions of India.

LUKE ASHLEIGH.†

THE school near the Hague, which is the scene Mr. Elwes has chosen for his picture of Boy-life in Holland, is not an imaginary, but a real—and if his picture is correct, an excellent—school, still in existence. In describing the amusements which schoolboys find amongst the Dutchmen, the author writes from observation sharpened by participation in his younger days; and his descriptions show that English lads may find the quiet Hollanders lively and agreeable companions, and hearty, too, though they have the reputation of being cold. His book has merits in addition to the new ground it opens. He writes clearly, though not always correctly, and what he describes the reader sees. Moreover, he has invested one of his characters with a gentlemanly mystery which gives his book an air of romance and not a little of its interest. If we wished to give a boy an idea of Holland, physical and social, apart from its juvenile relaxations, or with them, we should put this excellent book into his hands.

HISTORICAL TALES.‡

THE object of these tales is to give the reader a closer insight into the times to which they belong than can be obtained from the dry details of history. The objection presents itself at once that history moulded by the imagination of a writer of fiction is not to be trusted. The pure historian has the drawback of prejudice to fight against; and it is sufficiently formidable. Add to it the fabrications of the fancy, and what guarantee for accuracy is left? We quite agree with Mr. Dunster in his position, "that, although they are comparatively few who can seek amusement from history in its details, there are readers whose

* Carnatic Chronology: the Hindu and Mahomedan Methods of Reckoning Time Explained; with Essays on the Systems, Symbols used for Numerals, a New Titular Method of Memory, Historical Records, and other Subjects. By Charles Philip Brown, Member of the Royal Asiatic Society, late of the Madras Civil Service, Telugu Translator to Government, Senior Member of the College Board, &c. Author of the Telugu Dictionaries and Grammar, &c. Bernard Quaritch, 15, Piccadilly, London. August, 1863.

† Luke Ashleigh; a Schoolboy Life in Holland. By Alfred Elwes. Griffin & Farran.

‡ Historical Tales of Lancastrian Times. By the Rev. H. P. Dunster, M.A. With Illustrations by John Franklin. Griffin & Farran.

name is 'legion,' who may easily be attracted to history when it presents itself through the medium of romance." An historical romance is no doubt pleasanter reading than a dry historical narrative. But is it history? and if it is not, what is its value? Taking these tales as "tales" they are pleasant, and ably written. More than this, they will whet the reader's appetite for authentic history.

EVERYDAY SCRIPTURE DIFFICULTIES.*

THE idea of a book explaining everyday Scripture difficulties is excellent. We have often thought that if clergymen, instead of wearying their congregations with uninteresting sermons, barren of information, would set themselves systematically to explain such difficult portions of Scripture, much good would be effected and less ignorance of the Bible generally prevail. An attempt of this kind is made by Mr. Prescott in the volume before us, and with a tolerable measure of success. Each portion of Scripture selected is followed by a commentary of about a page long, containing some critical explanations, mixed with reflections suggested by the subject. But, though the style is light and easy and suited to the comprehension of ordinary readers, we think that Mr. Prescott's comments might be improved by a little more condensation and more terseness—more of explanatory matter, especially in a book undertaking the explanation of difficult passages, and a little less of mere declamatory remarks. We throw out this suggestion, as this volume, which takes in only St. Matthew's and St. Mark's Gospels, will probably be followed by one on those of St. Luke and St. John.

NAUTICAL DICTIONARY.†

No work of this kind has been in print in this country for some twenty years, the first edition of the present work having been long since sold out. Dr. Burney's edition of Falconer's Dictionary of the Marine, the latest other work of the kind, was published at a time when the learned editor thought that vessels which had been "invented and introduced by a native of Scotland, and successfully navigated on some of the American rivers at six knots an hour, might be of use in our navigable rivers and canals, and on the Scotch and Irish lakes." No one can reflect on the numbers of craft of all kinds now afloat on the seas, and not be surprised that such a dictionary as the present should not have been long since in common circulation. Recent improvements in ship-building, and especially the great use made of iron, must have caused the introduction of many terms, and have produced almost a revolution in the language of seafaring men. In the present edition every effort has evidently been made to adapt the book to the present condition of nautical requirements. The principal terms are printed in large capitals, and the subsidiary terms in small capitals, so as to readily catch the eye; and instead of figures to the heads of pages, the pagination is by letters in alphabetical succession; an excellent and facilitating plan for such a work. The woodcuts are abundant and carefully and well executed, and generally free from those errors and defects of un-nautical artists and engravers, which, under the best supervision, are liable to be accidentally passed. We have only noticed one such defect—the absence of ropes for hauling up the mainsail gaff on the woodcut sketch of a cutter. The sketch of a lugger is not quite ship shape, and although we will not say such do not exist, yet we have never seen a vessel of that denomination with either sham or painted port-holes. These, however, are very unimportant deficiencies, and in the various kinds of knots, tackle, and ship apparatus and fittings, the engravings possess very remarkable completeness. The type is clear and bold, and the book one equally worthy of author, printer, and publisher, and well deserving of the patronage of those who require such information as it is intended to give.

THE HANDBOOK OF FAMILY DEVOTION.‡

No words of ours are required to recommend anything from the pen of Heinrich Zschokke to the Christian public. This is a charming collection of what we might call short sermons, in the contemplative style, taken from the "Stunden der Andacht," the aim and tendency of which is, as is stated in the preface, to teach that "Christ ought to be the first Friend in every household." The account given by the author of the origin of his work is, that, sitting in his study absorbed in thought one evening in the year 1807, when there was great general suffering in Europe, and external religion had suddenly revived in masses, processions, pilgrimages, and so forth, the idea occurred to him of communicating to the families of Switzerland the religious ideas which had been the result of his experience. With this view he issued every week one of his "Devotional Meditations," bearing on some duty of private or social life as conceived in the light of Christian "faith, hope, and charity." The work, we are told in the preface to the present translation, was a favourite with the late Prince Albert, and was the manual of religious instruction read in the royal family circle. Before the death of the Prince, as if by some presentiment, the meditations on Death and Eternity were frequently read by him. Such facts will invest this volume with additional interest in the minds of English readers, and facilitate its reception in family circles.

THE TYPES OF GENESIS.§

THESE moral and allegoric paintings of the characters and events recorded in the book of Genesis will scarcely present much interest

* Every-day Scripture Difficulties Explained and Illustrated. By J. E. Prescott, M.A., late Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. Parker, Son, & Bourne.

† Nautical Dictionary: the technical language relative to the building and equipment of sailing-vessels and steamers, &c., with appendix of international regulations for preventing collisions at sea. By Arthur Young. 2 ed. Longmans, 1863.

‡ The Handbook of Family Devotion. By Heinrich Zschokke author of the "Meditations on Death and Eternity." Simpkin & Marsh ll.

§ The Types of Genesis, briefly considered as revealing the Development of Human Nature. By Andrew Jukes. Longman & Co.

to readers not of a mystical turn of mind. The interpretations may be in some cases true, but it is probable that in most they are strained and even over-strained, and such as never entered into the mind of the inspired writer himself. Every event is typical of some moral or religious condition of mind. Abraham is the spirit of faith, Isaac the spirit of sonship, Jacob of service, Joseph of suffering and glory, Noah of regeneration. Cain and Abel represent respectively the carnal and spiritual mind, and in like manner have the types their significance in other cases. The book is agreeably written, and in a lucid style—the work of a seriously contemplative mind, and abounds in many excellent reflections and truthful thoughts, and no doubt otherwise possesses attractions which will recommend it to a large class of pious readers. Mr. Jukes assumes, of course, the truth of the literal inspiration of Genesis, but as the creation is a type and figure of a moral genesis, the difficulties of a physical creation in six days do not exist for him.

NOCTES AMBROSIANÆ.*

THESE volumes are a first instalment of the collected works of Professor Wilson. If he had written nothing else than the Noctes, they are sufficient, notwithstanding very grave faults, to give him a lasting fame. Only a mind extraordinarily gifted could have produced them; and though they are marred by prejudice, and sometimes offend by their coarseness—the vituperation of Mr. Sheil to wit, and the exultation over the death-agonies of Burke the murderer,—we pardon these defects for the vein of wit and humour which runs through them, their shrewd sense, buoyant spirits, and often beautiful imagery. Embracing the period between 1822 and 1835, they revive for us the literary and political associations of that day in a picture full of living touches. The Noctes are thus to some extent history, coloured by the strong Tory prejudices of the writer; but, even so, valuable as preserving for us, by the hand of a master, the intense political bigotry of his school. Terribly abusive was old North when party feeling governed him. His invectives in this vein are grand specimens of Billingsgate. But the criticisms on books, men, and manners, far outweigh whatever objection may be raised to the Noctes on this score. Many of the descriptions are masterpieces; and “the Shepherd” is a character that for dry humour, sagacity, simplicity, and vanity, has never been surpassed, perhaps never equalled. Full of wit, wisdom, and eloquence, the Noctes may be opened at any page with only one drawback—the difficulty of laying them down. We read the same passages again and again without our relish for them being lessened. The two volumes before us have been carefully edited by the man most competent of all others for the task.

DOMESDAY BOOK.†

THAT such a book as this should be undertaken by a publisher shows how strong and growing is the desire to draw English history from contemporaneous documents. There is not a page in this volume which has not an historical interest, fresh, vital, and full of suggestion which can hardly mislead. It corresponds with the original, column for column, and line for line, and is intended to accompany the photographed facsimile of the original. This part relates to Surrey, which presents some peculiar features, pointed out in the preface. It has been produced evidently with the greatest care, and the notes, brief as they are, are a valuable, indeed indispensable, addition to the volume. No one calling himself a student of English history should be without this book.

THE AUTOGRAPH SOUVENIR.‡

No. 1 of “A Collection of Autograph Letters, Interesting Documents, &c., selected from the British Museum and other sources, public and private.” Not only for the interest attaching to the letters and documents promised in this series is it deserving of notice, but also for the aid it will afford the historical student of perusing for himself original documents belonging to the same times. Then, if it be true that handwriting is an index to character, this collection will enable us to read history to some extent by a new light. In the present number we have two letters in holograph of Queen Elizabeth, one of Gustavus Vasa, one of Cromwell, one of Robert Burns, and one of Mozart. This collocation is certainly curious, and does not indicate a highly intelligent plan. But variety is charming, and the “Autograph Souvenir” possesses at least that merit.

The History of the Primitive Christian Church in Britain. By WILLIAM PEACE. T. Danks, Crane-court.—A useful little book, containing much information, in the form of notes on Church History, chiefly in connection with the corruptions and errors introduced by the Papacy. But it is a sad mistake to write a book, however small, without a division into chapters. Resting-places are as necessary for the weary traveller in a book as on the Queen’s highway.

Inspiration: a Dialogue between a Christian and his Pastor. By the Rev. JAMES KELLY, M.A. James Nisbet & Co.—The author’s aim in this dialogue, spirited enough but not always sustained in truth to nature, is to establish in their highest sense the all-sufficiency and inspiration of Scripture. The question is one which has furnished little ground for agreement among the greatest and best thinkers of the day, and can scarcely be decided by this brochure.

The Claims of the Roman Catholic Church. By the Rev. H. J. PYE. Rivingtons.—This little book, consisting of a Sermon and Notes, is full of information on the much controverted question of the

* Noctes Ambrosianæ. By Professor Wilson. A New Edition in four volumes. Vols. I. and II. Blackwood & Sons.

† A Literal Extension of the Latin Text and an English Translation of Domesday Book, in relation to the county of Surrey. Vacher & Sons; Longmans.

‡ The Autograph Souvenir. By Richard Sims. F. G. Nethercliff.

Christian Rule of Faith. The writer very clearly shows that the teaching of the Church of Rome is true neither to Scripture nor tradition—either part of its own rule,—but is an offspring of the corrupt philosophy of the Middle Ages.

Scripture Record of the Life and Times of the Prophet Samuel. Rivingtons.—The events of Samuel’s life are here brought together and arranged in a biography written in a clear and rather attractive style. It is just the kind of book one would like to give to Sunday-school children as a premium.

The Articles of the Christian Faith: a Book of Suggestive Thought. Rivingtons.—In this book a tolerably fair account is given of Christian faith in its nature, origin, and several bearings, intellectual and emotional—an account which, being based on sound sense and Scripture teaching, may be read with much interest and improvement.

FINE ARTS.

MUSIC.

MR. BALFE’S NEW OPERA—“BLANCHE DE NEVERS.”

WHEN noticing Mr. Balfe’s “Armourer of Nantes” (in February last), we expressed our opinion that his light and transparent style was unequal to cope with the depth of expression and variety of character required in the musical illustration of a serious and romantic subject. Mr. Balfe, however, evinces no disposition to return to that less pretentious style in which his chief successes have been made, and, accordingly, his “Blanche de Nevers” is as great a mistake as its predecessor. The pretty tunes and the easy, careless gaiety of character, which cost the composer little effort to produce, and require none on the part of the audience to understand, pass off pleasantly enough when allied to a light piece of stage comedy of moderate duration; but four long and elaborate acts, in which various characteristic passions and situations of romantic and serious interest are to be musically illustrated, demand not only a deeper tone of thought, but also a more extended power of construction and development in shaping the framework of the musical ideas. Mr. Balfe was not fortunate in the libretto of the “Armourer of Nantes,” which was bad of its kind; and he has been even less so on the present occasion.

The drama of the “Duke’s Motto,” on which “Blanche de Nevers” is founded, is one of those ingenious pieces of French manufacture in which a rapid succession of startling incidents keeps the audience in constant suspense as to the fate of the principal characters. Imminent dangers and hair-breadth escapes alternate in such a way as to afford a series of surprises and maintain a feverish excitement until the final scene. There is no grand pervading sentiment forming the key-note of the whole. Love, it is true, is mixed up with the other ingredients, but quite subordinate to the realistic incidents which form the chief interest—such as whether so-and-so will escape, who committed the murder, who will punish the assassin, will there be a duel? and such like appeals to the commonest capacities for wonderment. Now this constant round of surprises can never be intelligible or appear probable when, instead of explanatory dialogue, the language is transferred to music. The very essence of the melodrama, originally intended for action and dialogue only, consists in the suddenness of the incidents and the rapidity with which they follow. When, therefore, these situations come to be suspended by the interpolation of music, the action halts, all illusion is destroyed; and an exciting melodrama, the improbabilities of which are forgotten in the breathless haste of its movement, becomes a dull compound, in which the text and the music are incumbrances on each other. In the serious and romantic opera, the plot cannot be too simple and undivided; as in “Fidelio,” “Sonnambula,” and other works in which there is but one great source of interest—some deep human sentiment of universal application. The plots of these and other such operas would almost be intelligible, as to their few incidents, in mere pantomimic action; and the music is left to fulfil its legitimate and poetical purpose in the elaborated expression of sensational emotions, too deep for the mere words employed. It is true Meyerbeer’s three great operas—“Robert,” “Les Huguenots,” and “Le Prophète”—approach in some respects very nearly to the style of melodrama; but even these works, the books having been originally laid out for musical purposes, contain but few incidents and situations, and these are so contrived as to admit of prolonged musical treatment, so that there is no appearance of interrupted dramatic action and consequent incongruous effect. The opera comique, on the other hand, is to be regarded rather as a combination of comedy with music than as opera proper—the alternation of dialogue full of brilliant, sparkling wit, with incidental pieces of music (such as we have in the joint productions of Scribe and Auber), is not felt as inconsistent in a work the interest of which is understood to be of a mixed kind, and not to include the higher aims of deep sentiment and poetical expression. The serious and romantic opera, however, should consist of music throughout—each separate air or concerted piece being linked together by brief accompanied recitatives, as in the modern French opera, instead of the almost obsolete old form of *recitativo parlante*, the conventional and stereotyped effect of which is now felt as a dead weight, even in the exquisite music of Mozart, most of whose operas are largely encumbered with this compromise between music and talk. In “Blanche de Nevers” we have sometimes a long scene of spoken dialogue; and in other situations the action is carried on through long

accompanied recitatives—these alternations producing a patchy and clumsy effect in strong opposition to the completeness and finish required in any production claiming to be a work of art. The appearance of forced labour rather than of spontaneous invention is so generally present throughout the opera that but slight passing notice is required of a series of pieces possessing but small merit in the aggregate, and so little to distinguish them from each other. Mr. Balfe has followed the precedent of the smaller Italian composers in shirking the composition of an overture to his work—that test of mastership demanding both thought and constructive skill, in which the composer is judged on his own merits, unaided by the factitious effects of singing and action. Accordingly, “Blanche de Nevers” is ushered in by a meagre prelude, having a kind of impromptu effect, and of little more value than the preliminary tuning of the instruments. The opening chorus, “What state can compare?” in Polacca time, is a piece of ordinary dance music, lively but common-place in subject and treatment, leading to a cavatina for the gipsy Zillah (Miss Hiles), “Would you learn the will of fate,” perhaps one of the best things in the opera. There is some archness of character in this, but the way in which the melody is sometimes driven against the same repeated chords of the accompaniment is very inartistic. Passing over the duet for Gonzagues (Mr. Weiss) and Zillah, we come to Lagardère’s (Mr. Harrison) song, “When I think of the days,” which, without possessing any special interest, leaves an impression of not being new. The duet, “’Tis hard my love from her to hide,” has little to recommend it but the climax, which is effective and worthy of belonging to a more important movement. The song for Blanche (Miss L. Pyne), “There is a void” (intended to be one of the selling ballads of the opera), is simple and expressive, but possesses no striking novelty of melody. The duet for Blanche and Zillah, “Oh, what a boundless joy,” is agreeable chiefly from the effect produced by the blending of two female voices in thirds and sixths, &c. The finale to the first act, as indeed may be said of the remaining finales, and the concerted music generally, is much too trite and undeveloped for a work of such pretensions. In the second act we have a comic song (so entitled), written with much spirit and humour, but with a dash of vulgarity in the words which fits it rather for the music-halls than for the national lyric stage. Lagardère’s cavatina, “Wilt thou think of me?” is graceful and elegant, but the frequent change of *tempo* destroys that continuity and simplicity which should characterize a movement of this class. It cannot be said that the music increases in interest as the opera proceeds, and the appearance of haste is more manifest towards the close than in the early portion. The duet, “Must we part?” commences with a phrase which is graceful, in spite of the indistinctness of the rhythm, but the unison passage in the third bar, which frequently recurs, is so common and vulgar as to mar the whole effect. The ballet music is noisy and lively, but has little freshness of melody. The chorus of soldiers is a robust tune, made prominent by a plentiful use of cornets and other brass instruments. The drinking song, “The old vine-tree,” aims at a character which it scarcely achieves, and its effect must be mainly ascribed to Mr. Weiss’s energetic delivery. We would gladly have been enabled to find more matter for praise in Mr. Balfe’s new work, but a grand romantic opera in four acts, produced at our first lyric theatre, is a work of such pretensions, and inevitably challenges such comparisons, that honest criticism has no resource but to judge it by reference to the standard thus set up, and to conclude therefrom that such productions are as disadvantageous to the interests of the art and of the management, as to the reputation of the composer. The opera was well mounted as to scenery and dresses; and the principal vocalists, —Misses L. Pyne, A. Hiles, and E. Heywood, Messrs. Harrison, Weiss, Corri, St. Albyn, and Rouse, exerted their best efforts on behalf of the composer, in whose success, such as it may be, they may fairly claim the larger share.

The specialties of the last Monday Popular Concert were Beethoven’s violin quintet in E flat, Mendelssohn’s pianoforte trio in C minor, Schubert’s solo sonata in B flat, and Vieuxtemps’ violin “fantasia appassionata,” Mr. Charles Hallé being the pianist, and M. Lotto the violinist. At the next concert Madame Arabella Goddard will reappear, playing Mendelssohn’s solo sonata, and, with Mr. Lazarus, Weber’s duo for piano and clarinet. Beethoven’s septet is also to be given on this occasion.

Mr. G. W. Martin’s National Choral Society commenced its fourth season on Wednesday night, with an excellent performance of “Judas Maccabeus,” Mr. Sims Reeves, absent from indisposition, being replaced by Mr. Cummings. This gentleman, hitherto chiefly known by his association with the concerts of the Glee and Madrigal Union, has a genuine tenor voice of pure and agreeable quality; and his success on this occasion was evidenced by his being encored in “Sound an alarm,” an arduous piece of declamatory singing, for which average powers are insufficient. Mdlle. Parepa, Miss Palmer, and Mr. Santley completed an admirable vocal quartet; and the choral and orchestral accompaniments were of parallel excellence.

THE QUEEN’S GIFT TO THE NATIONAL GALLERY.

THE valuable collection of pictures in our National Gallery has recently received important additions by the gift from her Majesty of a selection from the Wallerstein collection belonging to the late Prince Consort. Compared with many of the Continental collections our own in point of numbers is often exceeded, but none,

it is now generally admitted, possess a series so typical and so rich in authenticated and conspicuous examples. Any addition, therefore, that worthily fills up an hiatus, increases the special value it possesses, and does a far higher service than the mere addition of so many more pictures to the general show. The determination of the authorship of an ancient painting is not a light or easy matter, and indeed is very often all but impossible, and sometimes quite impossible, without a comparison with a certain and authenticated example by the same master as a standard to study his style, colouring, and manner of handling. In this respect the pictures recently added will prove most valuable, being in many cases Flemish and Tuscan pieces of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, which were wanted to fill up a long felt gap in the chronology of the series. The criticism of the works of the old masters is essentially a different task from the criticism of modern household pictures. The peculiar character of former times, the fervour of religious sentiment, the quaintness of habits and of dress, the primness and demureness of manners find their reflection in the works of those who laboured then, just as the frivolities of fashion, the sentimentalities of taste, and all the more intense qualities and vices of our own times find a mirror-like reflection in those of living and modern painters. The old pictures as preserved to us are chiefly those painted to decorate churches and architectural buildings, and have a suitable and appropriate rigidity and conventionality. Ours, chiefly designed for the ornamentation of domestic houses, have, too generally, a furniture and decorative aspect. No one who has studied the earliest European paintings of the fourteenth century could fail to notice this architectural quality in excess; and continuing the survey of art, we find this feature gradually but continuously fading away, until free drawing assumes a marked and almost exclusive preponderance. Some return to the stiffness of the Middle Ages has been made by the pre-Raphaelites, and for the severe religious subjects suitable for places of holy worship such a style has many accordant features. In viewing, then, the works of the ancient masters, we must regard them as representatives of the styles and progress of art at the epoch of their respective periods in the countries in which they were produced, and while making an appropriate allowance for their defects, deficiencies, and shortcomings, we must prominently give full honour to their real and palpable merits as being the pioneer efforts of true genius, rather than praise the general wonderful, painstaking, and elaborate finishing which are so characteristic of these early artists. As painting became advanced as an art, painters conceived bolder ideas, and acquired grandeur in the execution of them; here and there the brilliant genius of an individual accomplishing results that will last unsurpassed to the end of time. The pictures presented by the Queen belong rather to the curious than the unsurpassable as works of art, and were much needed for the further completeness of our National Collection. Many are most rare examples in quality of scarce masters. One thing is especially remarkable in them, their wonderful state of preservation. The fine air of Germany, in which for centuries they have been kept, has, we might almost say, scarcely tarnished, certainly not in the least deteriorated them. Some are hung on a special screen in the centre of one of the galleries, the rest being distributed in various apartments. The Wallerstein collection was formed at the end of the last and the beginning of the present century, by Prince Louis d’Ottingen Wallerstein, and was purchased in 1850 by the late Prince Albert, who entrusted Dr. Waagen with the duty of compiling a catalogue, but the German Professor seems in some cases to have rather arbitrarily, and even groundlessly, changed the Wallerstein designations; and consequently some re-assignments to their old titles and some altogether new designations have been appended by the National Gallery authorities. The pictures presented by the Queen run from No. 701 to No. 722 of the official catalogue. The first (701) of the Tuscan school is a “Coronation of the Virgin,” by Justus of Padua, or Giusto di Giovanni, of the family of the Menatoni, who was born at Florence about 1330, but settled at Padua in 1375. He is considered one of the best of Giotto’s followers and imitators. The present picture is on a small wood triptych, in the centre panel of which our Saviour is represented in the act of crowning the Virgin, whilst St. Paul, John the Baptist, Peter, Catherine, and Barbara stand at the foot of the throne. On the interior sides of the wings are the Annunciation, and the Birth, and Crucifixion of our Lord; on the exterior, the expulsion of Joachim from the Temple, the angel appearing to him to foretell the birth of the Virgin, the meeting of Joachim and Anna at the beautiful gate; the birth, presentation, and marriage of the Virgin. On the back is inscribed “Justus pinxit,” and on the plinth is the date 1367. No 702 is of the Umbrian school, the subject a “Madonna and Child,” painted by Andrea di Luigi or Aloisi, called L’Ingegno on account of his ability, and sometimes also Andrea di Assisi from the place of his birth. He was a contemporary of Perugino, and was painting at his birthplace in 1484; but little is known of his life or his works. This picture was styled a Raffaele in the Wallerstein catalogue. It is certainly, however, of the Umbrian school. No. 703 is another picture of this school, and presenting the same subject. The artist, Bernardino di Betto, commonly called Pinturicchio, was born at Perugia in 1454, and worked under Perugino at Rome. He was one of the most eminent artists of his time, and gave much attention to landscape. High art is not to be expected at so early a period, and this “Madonna and Child” offers no exception to the inherent deficiencies of the epoch to which it belongs. Regarding

duly its antiquity, it possesses excellent qualities, although the figures are stiff and unnaturally disposed, and the accessories not more relevant than is common to works of its age. An all but nude child is standing on a stone balcony—not, one would think, a safe place—with a thick rug thrown over, seemingly for warmth for the infant's feet; the Madonna looking down in a demure, simpering manner. Such is the extent of imagination, such the extent of conception, of a painter ranking as one of the best of his time. But when we come to the minutiae of his picture, such as the texture of the rug, we perceive a power of representing still-life worthy of any age and any master. Pictures by this artist are very rare. No. 704 is a small miniature (of the Tuscan school) of Cosmo I., Duke of Tuscany, by Angelo Bronzino (1502-1572), the pupil of Pontormo and friend of Vasari. On the opposite wall is one of the finest pictures in the National Collection, and the masterpiece of the same artist,—an allegorical representation of Venus, Cupid, Folly, and Time. No. 705 is a fine painting of the early German school, by Stephen Lochner or Loethoner, the master of the famous "Dombild" of Cologne. The subject consists of the three saints, Matthew, Catherine of Alexandria, and John the Evangelist. No. 706 is another picture of the German school; the subject is the "Presentation in the Temple," and the artist the master of the "Lyversberg Passion," sometimes known as the Meister von Werden, and sometimes as Israel von Meckenlen. The figures are excellent and the faces well painted and expressive. No. 707 is a part of an altar piece, assigned to the master of the "Cologne Crucifixion." Other portions of this work are in the Gallery of Munich. The portion in our Gallery presents two saints, Peter and Dorothy, the former holding in one hand the gold and silver keys and in the other a pair of spectacles in form not unlike those now worn. The Dorothy has a basket of roses. No. 708 is a Madonna and Child by Margaret van Eyck, the sister of the well-known artists Hubert and John. She appears to have been residing at Ghent in 1418. The finish of this very small picture is very high, and the flesh clean and smooth. The robes are of pure red and blue. The gold brocade of the curtain is remarkably rendered, and the hands of the Madonna good in drawing. No. 709—Few pictures are rarer than those by Meming, one of the earliest and most distinguished of the Flemish painters. He possessed a house, in 1479, in the Rue St. Georget at Bruges, but few particulars of his life are known. In the picture before us are represented the Madonna and infant Christ, almost in the identical positions of those in the "Madonna and Infant Christ Enthroned" (No. 686), previously in the National Collection, and evidently painted from the same models—his wife and child. The Baron de Triqueti, in his review of the National Gallery a few years since, regretted there was no example in it of this clever artist's works. We have now two superb paintings of this rare master. No. 710 is the portrait of a monk with his hands raised in prayer, by Hugo Van der Goes of Ghent, the scholar and imitator of the Van Eycks. He died in 1478, in the Augustine convent of Rooden Closter, near Brussels, to which he had retired a few years before. His style is severe, but the monk's face is expressive, and the hands admirably foreshortened. No. 711, at "Mater Dolorosa," and No. 712, an "Ecce Homo," are by Roger Van der Weyden the younger, probably the son or grandson of the elder painter of the same name. The era of this painter was from 1450 to 1529, and his "Ecce Homo" (712) may be well and advantageously compared with the grand head by Correggio. Weyden's conception of the Saviour's sorrow is, however, very different, perhaps more tender and less deep. Correggio has painted an intensity of grief "too deep for tears." Weyden gives relief to the grief in tears that seem to roll away on the canvas from the reddened eyes. The lower half of the Saviour's face has not perhaps been rendered by Weyden with the same force with which he has depicted the upper portion. It is a fine picture, and shows a delicate sensibility of mind. The background of both, as frequent in early pictures, are of gold, stippled with black or brown, so as to give a sort of glory around the figures. No. 713 belongs to the Dutch school. "The Virgin and Child in a Garden," seated under a tree; by their side an earthen vase of pinks. The painter, Jan Mostaert, of Haarlem, was a scholar of Jacob van Haarlem, and resided eighteen years at the Court of Margaret of Austria. His period was from 1474 to 1556. No. 714—"Mother and Child," by Cornelius Engelbertz (A.D. 1468-1533), reputed to have been the master of Lucas of Leyden, where he was one of the earliest oil-painters. Most of his important religious works were destroyed by the Dutch iconoclasts of the sixteenth century. No. 715, "The Crucifixion, with St. John and the three Marys, and Salome;" No. 716, "St. Christopher carrying the infant Christ;" and No. 717, "St. John on the Island of Patmos," are three excellent examples of the early Flemish school, by Joachim de Patinir, born at Dinant about 1490. The first is remarkable for the extraordinary purity and freshness of its preservation and original colouring, especially the palish blues of the sky and dresses, as also for the transparency of the verdigris-like green of the landscape. All three are remarkable pictures. No. 718, "Mount Calvary: Christ on the Cross;" No. 719, "The Magdalen;" two Flemish pictures by Henrik de Bles, the scholar of Patinir, born at Bouvignes, in 1480. He was called Civetta by the Italians from his frequently placing an owl in his pictures, which are generally a combination of landscape and figure-painting. The latter picture is one of the finest in artistic quality in the presented collection. The Magdalen holds a vase of ointment in her right hand, and through an ornamented archway is seen a distant landscape and the sea. The face is finely and delicately painted, with infinite expression; and the hair and robes

of the figure, the architecture of the archway, and all the accessories are remarkably firmly painted, though perhaps too severely to please the popular taste. It undoubtedly is an extraordinary work. No. 720, "The Holy Family at a Fountain," which, it is singular to note, still exists at Brussels, and No. 721, a portrait of a lady, are two other Dutch pictures. John Schoorel, their painter, so surnamed from his birthplace, died at Utrecht in 1562. He was painter, poet, and musician, and a pupil of Albert Dürer. The last of the series, No. 722, is a portrait of a lady, by Sigismund Holbein, the uncle of the younger Hans. He was a native of Augsburg, and was living at Berne, in Switzerland, in 1540, as is known from his dating there his will bequeathing his property to his nephew in England.

Although the Queen's gift includes no works of large size, and but few exceed the dimensions of what would be called cabinet pictures, it ranks as one of the most important additions ever made to the National Collection; and is the more especially valuable as affording examples of masters and periods which were not before represented.

A MONUMENT to the French and English soldiers who fell in the fight of the 28th April, 1760, has been erected on the Plateau of Sainte Foy at Quebec.

A SUITABLE building for the new School of Art at Nottingham is in course of erection. The porch tower will be 120 feet in height, and its dome will be covered with Minton's encaustic tiles.

THE Report of the Bristol School of Design states an improved financial condition, but complains that the wealthy west has not supported the school with sufficient munificence. Improvement is also recorded in the works of the students.

THE new building of the Coventry School of Art has been formally opened with a conversazione under the presidency of Lord Leigh.

MR. FOLEY is to execute a memorial for the late Prince Albert at Dublin; and Mrs. Thornycroft an equestrian statue for Halifax.

A COMMISSION has been given to Baron Marochetti for a memorial statue in bronze of the late Sir George Cornwall Lewis, to be placed in front of the Shire Hall at Hereford.

MR. RAINBACH, the master of the Birmingham School of Art, has been despatched to Paris to report on the works of the students of the French Schools of Design in the exhibition at the Champs Elysées.

A PROPOSAL has been started for the purchase of Mr. Desanges' paintings, illustrative of the deeds of the Victoria Cross heroes. The purchase of these fifty pictures might be easily accomplished by a combination of subscribers, and their preservation and public exhibition would perpetuate the recollection of the noble acts by which these marks of bravery were won.

SCIENCE.

THE NEW CATALOGUE OF NEBULÆ.

SINCE the time when the hypothesis of the formation of stellar worlds by the condensation of the vaporous matter in space was promulgated some years ago, the nebulae or bright cloudy patches in the heavens have been subjects of increased and increasing interest, although further and deeper researches than those which gave rise to the "nebular theory" have not afforded any confirmatory proof of its correctness, and although, indeed, these subsequent observations have tended rather to diminish than to increase the credibility of that doctrine, for the great telescopes of Lord Rosse and others have resolved many of these seeming patches of luminous haze into vast groups of uncountable stars, each shining by its own bright light like our glorious sun. And with these luminous clouds of stars, the whole heavens are studded—some visible, some invisible to the human eye, some only to be seen by the aid of powerful telescopes, while uncountable numbers still lie beyond in those vast remote realms of space into which our best instruments have never penetrated. Still more recently a further interest has been given to these wonderful star-clouds by the presumption of the variability of their luminosity. The light of some has been supposed to have gone out, so that myriads of once bright suns could no longer be distinguished in the darkness of the endless void.

The important catalogue, recently presented to the Royal Society, by Sir John Herschel, was no ordinary labour. It was one requiring intense patience and perseverance, and a large amount of time, and in its result more beneficial to others than to the able astronomer who undertook it. Fifty years ago such telescopes as have been used of late were unattainable; and therefore it is not surprising that the Earl of Rosse and Mr. Lassell with their transcendent reflectors, M. d'Arrest with the great refractors at Leipsic and Copenhagen, Father Secchi at Rome, the American astronomers at Harvard College, MM. Anwers, Messier, Dunlop, Lacaille, and many other astronomers, with fine and powerful instruments have devoted researches to these extraordinary objects, and have added numerous new ones to our previous knowledge. The accounts and notices of their discoveries are scattered through many works in many languages, and since the late Sir William Herschel's famous Catalogue of Nebulae, no collective statement of these important details has been attempted. No one could fail to perceive the impetus which would be given to this branch of astronomical research by a new general catalogue of all the nebulae and clusters of stars now known both in the northern and southern hemispheres arranged in order of right ascension, and reduced to

a common and sufficiently advanced epoch, which might serve as a general index, and enable an investigator to turn his instrument direct upon any he desired to view, as well as to afford him the means of instantly determining whether an object encountered in his observations had been previously observed. In the absence of such a catalogue numerous records of the same nebulae have undoubtedly been continually made, and many a supposed comet would have been recognised as a nebula had such a catalogue existed. Such, briefly, then, was the object Sir John had in continuing, completing, and reducing to the necessities of present workers, the catalogue made by his father, and brought to the epoch of 1800. To do this effectually, required a preliminary reduction to 1830 of that catalogue. So reduced, it afforded Sir John the means of detecting and modifying many errors of nomenclature. Sir John's own observations, and the imperfect entries and deficiencies in his father's catalogue, were next made good. Carried to this stage, it was next necessary to bring the whole up to a still more advanced epoch. This labour not calling for any discussion or collation, but being one of mere arithmetic or computation to a definite formula, assistance was liberally granted by the Royal Society for its execution. The plan adopted was to bring each object in the catalogue up to the year 1880 by the application of approximate precessions in right ascension and polar declination, and the places so obtained were then employed to compute the exact precessions in both, by the usual formulæ with co-efficients—viz, in R. A. = $3^{\circ}072 + 1^{\circ}337$ and in N. P. D. = $20^{\circ}06$, and the precessions so calculated were then used to bring up the places from 1830 to 1860, the epoch of the catalogue; so that, the places being given for 1860, and the precessions for twenty years in advance, the application of those precessions to those places will give dependable places for any year up to A.D. 1930. The catalogue is arranged in twelve columns, the first containing the general or current number from 1 to 5,063, the total number of objects recorded. The second contains the numbers of those nebulae of which observations are given in former catalogues; from 1 to 2,307, being those given in the "Philosophical Transactions" for 1833; and from 2,308 to 4,021, from Sir John's Cape observations. The third column contains the classes and numbers of the nebulae as given by Sir William Herschel in his three catalogues in the "Philosophical Transactions" for 1786, 1789, and 1802 respectively. The fourth contains references to other authorities, and gives either the names of the first discoverers, or a reference to the periodical, work, or catalogue which has been taken as the authority for the place set down. Column 5 gives the right ascension in time for 1860; the sixth the precession in seconds and decimals calculated for 1880; the seventh the number of observations which have been actually used in the computation. Columns 8, 9, and 10 contain, in like manner, the north polar distances for 1860 and the precessions for 1880, with the number of observations used in obtaining this element. In the eleventh column there is a short description of the nebula or cluster in abbreviated words, with particulars of brightness, size, and extent in arithmetical approximation; in this last labour it was found, when a comparison of several descriptions at different times was made, that the statements could hardly ever be reconciled except by allowing to each qualification a latitude of meaning extending over several degrees of the arbitrary scale. In many cases the discordance or even contradiction was sufficient to authorize a strong suspicion of variability in the object itself. In respect to size, Sir John found so little evidence of the adherence by observers to any definite standard that nothing but confusion would have arisen from the introduction of such estimates. As, however, in the use of such a catalogue as the present some guide is necessary to advertise the observer what sort of object he may expect to see, Sir John has adopted the following system of terms. Thus, a nebula 3" or 4" in diameter would be called "extremely small;" one of 10" or 12", "very small;" 20" to 30", "considerably small" or "small;" 50" or 60", "pretty small" or "pretty large;" 3' to 4', "considerably large" or "large;" 8' to 10', "very large;" 15' to 20' and upwards, "extremely large." In estimating clusters of well-separated and scattered stars a wider acceptance is given to such terms; for instance, a cluster of 1' in extent would be considered "extremely" or "very small;" one of 15' or 20', "large;" and those of 30' or 40', "very large"—these latter amplifications of scale not being applicable, however, to those resolved, or resolvable globular groups which belong properly to the class of nebulae. The twelfth, or final column of the catalogue, contains the number of times that each nebula has been observed by his father or himself, or by either, and whether the place has or has not been obtained, comprising all cases where the object has been seen, and whether described or not. Since attention has been drawn to the real or presumed variability of nebulae, and since it can hardly be doubted that comets have occasionally been observed as nebulae, this enumeration is not without very important utility. References are also given in the catalogue to the works in which figures of various nebulae are given. This catalogue, it is to be remembered, is still only in manuscript, but the Royal Society will, it is to be hoped, soon determine on its publication. In the hands of such an excellent and liberal society there can be no doubt a proper and immediate promulgation of such valuable labours will be effected. Rarely, indeed, have works of such importance been continued from generation to generation by the members of one family as have been done by the Herschels. In his prefatory comments on his work Sir John paid a well-merited tribute of compliment and gratitude to his aunt, Miss Caroline Herschel, who herself arranged in zones of one degree of breadth in polar distance the

nebulae in his father's catalogue, a labour giving results the value of which Sir John acknowledges, as other astronomers will also do, and one requiring rare skill, diligence, and accuracy.

RAINBOWS BY REFLECTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "LONDON REVIEW."

SIR,—About two months before the recent meeting of the British Association I communicated to a very high authority certain facts in relation to rainbow and spectrum reflection, which I thought were sufficiently interesting to justify mention at the meeting. No notice having been taken there, I wish to call the attention of the scientific world to them through the medium of your journal. They certainly appear to conflict with the received doctrine of refraction, and I think it is desirable that those entitled to speak and decide should tell us whether the disagreement is apparent only, or real. Some time ago the question was raised in the "LONDON REVIEW," whether the rainbow could be seen [by reflection from water, or indeed from any perfect reflector. Opinions differed, but observations proved the fact that the reflection is visible; and all difficulty of acceptance was removed by another fact, that the rainbow is not a single bow, but a multitude of bows, and that each person, or rather each eye, has its appropriate spectrum. Hence, it was obvious that a certain bow might fall upon the water and be reflected from it in the same angle, and therefore be visible to a person looking upon the rainbow in the sky. The discussion in your journal led me to make further experiments in relation to the general subject, and out of these issued the following facts, which, to say the least, are certainly worthy of record.

1. Take the mirrors of a kaleidoscopic tube and apply the eye at one end so as to take in a small arc of the rainbow; then slightly depress the mirrors (the object being so distant), and in each mirror will be seen two reflections of the arc, making one larger and continuous arc of a uniform spectrum.
 2. Take a fluid prism and place it on a plain mirror of thick plate-glass laid horizontally; pass a powerful light through the prism and produce a spectrum; the eye then sees from one position (when looking very obliquely upon the mirror) the original spectrum, and six or seven reflections of the same spectrum produced by successive reflections from the two surfaces of the glass plate.
 3. Apply the kaleidoscopic tube to the spectrum in the last experiment, and a perfect circle of similar spectra are seen when the eye is applied to the mirror at their angular junction.
- Nearly two years since you did me the honour to report very fully my experiments and views in relation to light and colour, and of course I am disposed to regard the result of the experiments now communicated from my own stand-point. I prefer, however, in the meantime, to submit them to the learned in science rather than obtrude my own opinions concerning them.

I am, yours obediently,

THOMAS ROSE.

11, Florence-place,
Glasgow, Sept. 21, 1863.

ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY, November 24th.—Professor Tennant exhibited a fossil egg of the *Æpyornis maxima*, stated to have been obtained from a depth of forty feet, in some iron mines in Madagascar. A letter was read from Dr. Short, relating to a singular habit of the frugivorous bats of India, which were stated to have been witnessed in the act of catching fishes out of a tank. The Secretary exhibited a sample of a naturally variegated sheep's-wool from Ohio, forwarded by Mr. J. P. Hayard, through Mr. A. R. Weld. A paper was read by Dr. Bowerbank, F.R.S., on the genus *Spongilla*, in which full descriptions of twenty-one species of that genus were given. Mr. A. R. Wallace read a communication "On the Birds of the Islands of Timor, Flores, and Lombok, and on the relations of the Fauna of these islands to India and Australia." The following communications were read, "On a new flexible Coral from Madeira of the genus *Juncella*," by Mr. J. Y. Johnson; "On New Mollusca," by Mr. A. Adams; "On the New Caledonian Kagu," by Dr. Bennett; "Madagascar Insects," and "Australian Crustacea," by Mr. Bates, &c.

VANDALISM IN ESSEX.—The famous Roman grave-mounds, known as the Bartlow Hills, after having been spared by the plough and the harrow for more than a thousand years, have at length been condemned to destruction in order to accommodate a trivial feeder of the Great Eastern Railway. In so flat a district as the borders of Cambridge-shire and Essex a slight deviation is perfectly practicable; but so wantonly has the new line been adjusted that, as actually staked out for immediate operations, it will bisect two adjacent tumuli of the curious group. The matter having been brought under the notice of the Archaeological Institute, the council of that body have very properly addressed a remonstrance to the directors of the railway, and it is to be hoped they will be successful in preserving these interesting vestiges of antiquity, which are among the most singular relics we possess of a very early and obscure period in the history of our country.

STEEL FOR SHIPBUILDING.—During the past week two large vessels built of steel were launched from the yard of Messrs. Jones, Queeggan, and Co., at Liverpool; one a sailing ship, the *Formby*, of 1,271 tons, for the East India trade; the other a paddlewheel steamer, the *Hope*, of 1,492 tons. Mr. Jones remarks on these vessels that steel is much stronger than iron, weight for weight, and consequently in shipbuilding that equal strength can be given with less weight of steel than of iron. The strain resisted by iron-built ships had been found to be from 19 to 20 tons per square inch, while the resistance of steel is found to range from 42 to 48, giving a mean of 45 tons for steel, or considerably more than double the strength of iron. The *Formby* thus required 500 tons of material in her hull, while a similar ship of iron would have required 800 tons. The difference in weight of hull would cause a difference of nearly two feet in displace-

ment in favour of the steel vessel, involving also less propelling power. In steamers the advantages were still more in favour of steel. If the *Persia*, a steamer of 3,600 tons and 900-horse power, had been built of steel instead of iron, her displacement would have been diminished about one-sixth, and she would have been able to carry double her present cargo.

SOME interesting trials have recently been made at the Royal Engineers' field-works, Chatham, for the purpose of testing a new description of suspension-bridge, for military purposes, invented by Sergeant-Major J. Jones, of the Royal Engineers. The bridge was formed of galvanized iron bands, of about 3 inches in width, and the thirtieth part of an inch in thickness. These were joined together at the end, by means of a button and eye; and, notwithstanding the apparent slenderness of the material, bore an enormous weight. Eight widths of the iron bands, each four bands thick, formed the "chains" of the suspension-bridge, and on these were laid the chesses, used in pontooning, which served as the floor of the bridge, the whole being steadied by means of guy ropes, fastened to stakes. With these materials a bridge having a span of 130 feet was formed by thirty sappers in six hours. A battery of mounted field artillery was marched across, the bridge having only a very slight oscillation; thirty soldiers were next marched in step, which was the greatest strain to which the structure could be put; the only perceptible defect was the oscillation of the bridge, which ultimately loosened one of the stays.

PNEUMATIC DESPATCH TUBES.—The Pneumatic Despatch Company are about to lay down an enormous tube for the transmission of letters and parcels from their station in Holborn to a station to be established near the General Post-office, in St. Martin's-le-Grand. One of that kind already exists between the North-Western district post-office, in Eversholt-street, and the Euston terminus of the London and North-Western Railway, and letters have been carried between those places since the beginning of February last. It is now proposed to lay a similar one from the Euston Station, through Woburn-place, Southampton-row, and King-street to Holborn, thence along Holborn, Skinner-street, and Newgate-street, to the General Post-office. This tube is to be of cast-iron, 4 feet high and 4 feet 6 inches wide, internally. The tube will pass over the Fleet sewer, and under the London, Chatham, and Dover Railway. At the west-end of Newgate-street it will be 25 feet deep; its depth at St. Martin's-le-Grand being 12 feet. When completed, the transmission of all letters in bulk between the General Post-office and the North-Western Railway will be effected by its agency, as will also large parcels of goods. An arrangement has been made with Messrs. Pickford to forward parcels from their depot in Gresham-street to the North-Western Railway, and an extension of the tube into their premises is ultimately contemplated. This line of tubing, moreover, is understood to be but the commencement of a system which is to be eventually extended to the various metropolitan railway stations, and probably to connect all the district post-offices in London. The Pneumatic Despatch Company have powers under their Act to lay down tubes within the city, and Mr. Haywood, the engineer to the Commissioners of Sewers, states in his recent report that, assuming the pneumatic system to work satisfactorily, it will become a valuable means of freeing the streets of much goods traffic. In laying down these tubes the depth must be greater than that of the street sewers.

MR. HENRY RILEY, of the Inner Temple, is a candidate for the City Remembrancership. Mr. Riley has been long known for his works on the early history of London, its laws, franchises, and usages, and is eminently fitted as a lawyer for the office. But his literary acquirements are even more valuable for the duties he will have to perform, if he should be the fortunate successor of Mr. Tyrrell.

FEVER IN THE METROPOLIS.—There has been a great increase of typhus in the metropolis during the present winter. The number of patients admitted into the London Fever Hospital, which in June did not exceed 89, in October amounted to 236. Of the latter number 155 cases were typhus, 24 enteric fever, and 30 scarlet fever. During the first sixteen days of the present month no fewer than 170 cases were admitted, mostly were typhus. The hospital contains 200 beds, but since the beginning of October numbers of applicants have been refused admission for want of room. The typhus patients are mainly from the south and east districts, especially from Rotherhithe, Bermondsey, Lambeth, St. Saviour's, and St. George's-in-the-East. There are indications also of more general prevalence. Shore-ditch and the City of London are now furnishing a larger number of cases, and patients have been brought within the last three weeks from Hackney, Kensington, and other parishes. The Committee of the London Fever Hospital have determined to increase their accommodation by the erection of a temporary wooden building for 60 beds.

CONSUL PETHERICK, in a letter to the *Times*, repudiates a statement made on the occasion of Captain Speke's reception at the Geographical Society, that the meeting "would be pleased to hear that Mr. Petherick was in perfect health and excellent spirits, and trading energetically when he last heard of him." He says that "neither at the time of our meeting, several months before that event, or since, up to the present moment, have I either enjoyed good health, good spirits, or occupied myself with trading; and now, when writing this, I am tormented with guinea worm in the foot and other parts of the body."

THE Dublin Corporation has granted a salary of £100 to Dr. Cameron as City analyst, the fees received by him in his public capacity to be handed over to the City treasurer. The Lord Mayor is also authorized to purchase food suspected to be adulterated, and to submit it to this officer for analysis.

M. DE SAULCY, the French antiquary, has embarked for Jerusalem to study afresh the monuments of Judæa, particularly those of the countries beyond the Jordan, which have been hitherto only incompletely explored, hoping to find the confirmation of his ideas of Judaic art. He is accompanied by M. Salzmann, the explorer of Camiros, the Abbé Michon, accomplished in the knowledge of the Holy Land, and

by Staff-Captain Géles, the author of a map of part of Syria. This mission is under the patronage of the Minister of Public Instruction, and has been encouraged by a grant from the State. No one could be better prepared for such an undertaking than M. de Saulcy.

THE Rev. Mr. Hall's paper read at the Ethnological Society was an elaboration of his memoir at the British Association "On the Aboriginal Occupation of North Tynedale," embodying recent researches on the aboriginal settlements of the western parts of Northumberland. In those regions there exist remains of two kinds of British fortified towns—hill-forts and lowland-fastnesses; the former on the tops of upland ridges, crags, or rounded heights; the latter on escarpments and platforms, generally flanked by deep ravines or the precipitous banks of mountain streams—in one instance in the middle of a morass near the basaltic cliffs of Sewingshields. One of the finest of the hill forts is on Warden Hill, 600 feet above the sea, and commanding an extensive view. Its area, including three concentric ramparts, is about two acres, and within these defences some of the circular foundations of the old habitations can yet be traced. On the opposite bank of the North Tyne is another fortress built, like others of these settlements, of massive unhewn blocks of freestone. At Lonbrough, Catlan Ridge, Wark's Burn, Bridge House, Stone Folds, Leek Hill, and Hindridge, vestiges of the Cyclopean walls of such primitive fortifications remain; as also do others east of the river, on the banks of the Rede, and along the ridge of Otterburn. Remains of the Lowland fastnesses occur at Keilder Castle, Heselyside, Bortley, Redesmouth, west of Wansback, at Countess Pook woods, Gunnerston, Falstone. Near Keildy, eleven examples occur, some very perfect, particularly the double fort called "Bran's Wall;" the shape is that of two irregular ellipses, covering about an acre of ground, within which eleven hut-circles can be traced, of an average diameter of 24 feet. The largest is on the elevated ground above the Carey House fort, and is in the form of a parallelogram, encompassing about ten or twelve acres. Six terraces face the north-west, and run for 450 yards, varying from ten yards to a few feet in breadth, and being in some places 10 feet high. Another class of aboriginal remains were also noticed—the cragan, or burial mounds. Often these occur within or at the entrance of the forts, usually facing the east—the cardinal point of many primitive races, as the north is to us. The author argued that the builders of the ancient forts were of the Celtic race, and quoting from Ptolemy and other of the old geographers, he was of opinion they were of the tribe or nation of the Gadeni—a people occupying a territory between the Brigantes, south of the Tyne, and the Ottadeni eastwards, on the coasts of the German Ocean. These early remains are chiefly situated on the estates of the Duke of Northumberland, who has recently begun an accurate antiquarian survey of North Tynedale, under the direction of Mr. MacLauchlan, an experienced archaeologist. Explorations have already been made of some of the largest ancient British towns amongst the Cheviot hills—as at Greaves' Ash, near Linhope, in the valley of the Beamish, and on Yevering Bell, near Wooler. Attention was also drawn in the paper to ancient heaps of iron scorise near Birtles, which relics the author stated had hitherto escaped the notice of antiquaries.

THE vacant Professorship of Chemistry at Berlin has been given to Professor Bunsen, of Heidelberg.

THE foundation stone of the Surrey County Middle-class School, at Cranley, near Guildford, was laid during the past week, by the Archbishop of Canterbury. The object is to supply a sound and plain education based on the principles of the Church of England and on the public school system for the sons of farmers and others engaged in commercial pursuits. The building is to be erected near a proposed station of the Guildford and Horsham Railway, where eight acres have been secured. It will accommodate 100 boarders, and will be capable of enlargement. Towards the erection of the building, £4,000 has already been raised, but £5,000 more is required to complete the work.

THE EXHIBITION OF NADAR'S BALLOON.—The balloon at the Crystal Palace will be continued during the Great Metropolitan Cattle Show, which will be held in the second week in December.

MONEY AND COMMERCE.

THE money market, although it is certainly rather less disturbed than a week or two ago, has not resumed an appearance of ease, and it seems difficult to believe that we shall immediately experience a reduction in the rates. The Bank of France is likely to maintain its position; the Bank of England cannot alter its terms while the efflux of specie to India and Egypt continues so extensive, and foreign political relations will interfere with the tranquillity of the other Bourses, while sympathetic action with Paris and London will assist to support the systems of discount at Amsterdam, Vienna, Hamburg, and Frankfort. Under these circumstances, there cannot be for a long period what is considered cheap money; nor would it be desirable there should be, when such a strong tendency to active speculation exists, and every advantage appears to be taken of the least change in affairs to push ephemeral enterprise.

One would have presumed that the public in reality must have been surfeited before this by the number of companies brought out; but the happy knack that exists in certain directions of getting anything with a title and prospective expectation of business to a premium drags in that portion of the operators who have no resources in other directions, and who make it a special branch of

their arrangements to run after allotments and sell for the premium directly profit is available. Of course, as these parties have everything to gain and nothing to lose, they benefit themselves as far as they can through the amiability of friends or the influence of directors.

We are, we hear, to be favoured shortly with a variety of more new companies—bank, shipping, and other trading projects, which it is said will carry all before them. It is presumed that the market may be able to bear them, for, although not numerous, they will gratify the taste of the speculators, the shipping being especially a new description of company for negotiation. At the same time, it is thought that the depression in trade, through the high terms for discount, will create a vacuum which must be filled up, the taste of the great majority having run recently towards the Stock Exchange. The banking, credit company, and hotel manias having been in a great degree exhausted, a new path for promoters must be sought, and that path is in the shipping line. The Cunard route has encountered its rival in the National Steam Shipping Company, the West India and Royal Mail Steam Company in the West India and Pacific Company; and probably, if any one is discovered with sufficient daring, the supremacy of the Peninsular and Oriental may be threatened. Not, however, if it be remembered that the Great Eastern was started with this intention, and that the European and Australian Companies became miserable failures through endeavouring to cope with what has been termed "a giant monopoly of the ocean highway."

Now, we would respectfully caution the public against speculating too wildly in connection with any new schemes of steam navigation that may be announced. Before the Royal Mail Steam Company secured its present flourishing condition it had great difficulties to combat; the General Screw Company, with all the support it derived from a powerful combination, fell through; the Royal Australian, when it was started, notwithstanding the high terms of freight and the attractions of the gold-fields, floundered for a long time, and then was finally liquidated; the European Company, though it obtained the Australian contract, had to work it with the aid of borrowed vessels; and the Great Eastern, under the fresh *alias* of the Great Ship Company, is now in "a sea of trouble," in consequence of the ill-success of the vessel and the endeavours of the mortgagees to realize their debt. Such a picture as this is not very promising, and yet the new companies launched have gone to a very high premium, and will, it is alleged, be maintained at that point.

Of course we can have no objection to seeing these shares command a value out of all proportion to intrinsic merits, notwithstanding that every one of the companies may propose to work on the base of an old-established private concern; but, nevertheless, it may be as well to suggest to buyers at these prices that a little investigation might save them from ultimate loss. The area for the operations of shipping companies must undoubtedly be restricted, and therefore no very widespread mischief can be anticipated from their extension. The few, however, that will be started will nevertheless suck up three or four millions of capital, and it will be very speedily wasted if directors are not vigilantly looked after and their proceedings criticised. The depreciation in value of vessels, the heavy losses on stocks of coals, stores, &c., at outstations, are facts which have been painfully realized by old proprietors in large steam navigation companies; and if extensive competition is to be encouraged, these sacrifices will once more have to be repeated. A select few will naturally profit by the contracts and the subsidiary arrangements, but the great mass of the shareholders will have to bear the brunt of the general outlay.

The directors and promoters of these companies themselves, if they have any regard for their own credit and position, will proceed cautiously and slowly; for, however well intentioned they may be in originating these enterprises, the experience of the past will teach them that they must not look upon everything as certain, either with respect to future profit or the careful avoidance of loss.

We wonder, after this new phase of speculation shall have been exhausted, what will be the next stage of the movement. It will not be long before it has run through the field of the shipping interest, since, although the relations are large, few amalgamations are likely to be effected, this field not being so open as that associated with banks or hotels. Amalgamations and absorptions, as they are called, appear to be, in every department, the order of the day, and if shareholders are benefited by these arrangements, the public no doubt have to pay for it when the undertaking is fully developed.

Mining enterprise has, it would appear, gone altogether out of fashion. The irregular transactions among the dealers, the un-

scrupulous measures adopted to bring properties into notice, and the facility with which reports can be concocted to order, have long rendered these undertakings unpopular, and the consequence is that they are left to be preyed upon by the worst class of outsiders. Occasionally a prize turns up among the thousand and one blanks afloat in the market, and this forms the basis of many other competitive companies. Without some fresh popular invention is called into vogue and worked by public enterprise, we can scarcely see any medium through which promoters or speculators will be able to feather their nests. The success of the new school has introduced a host of imitators, and this profession or branch of business is being cut into like every other, so that in the end it will be hardly worth pursuing. But after this state of things shall have died out, and only the wreck of present prices shall be remembered, some fertile genius will devise some new plan by which fortunes may be obtained and the public quietly ensnared.

If the value of money were further to advance, as some persons say that it must, with gold flowing to Egypt as it does, and being inclined to take journeys to Mauritius, the order of the latest of the school will be damped and the best of recent undertakings must be shelved. It cannot fail to be admitted that the sensitive state of prices at the Stock Exchange indicates how very treacherous is the ground upon which transactions are placed. An additional advance in the rate is considered inevitable through these continuous gold withdrawals, and from what can be ascertained they will make progress, not only eastward but also to other quarters. The foundation of the efflux of bullion must in the main be ascribed to the cotton dearth, which seems yet calculated to have a strong influence.

The Bank directors assembled on Thursday and separated without making any alteration in the rate of discount. The terms out of doors among the general brokers vary from $5\frac{1}{2}$ to 6 per cent. The Bank return for the week shows an increase in the reserve of notes of £500,000. The bullion presents a slight decrease of £51,000. The revenue payments continue to make good progress.

The withdrawals of bullion are again augmenting. £100,000 went to Egypt on Thursday, and £28,000 to Mauritius. It appears the Peninsular and Oriental Mail takes out £624,000. Although we have arrivals occasionally, they are at once purchased for export. The greater part of the present shipments to Alexandria seem to be on behalf of the Egyptian Commercial Company, who have issued the debentures recently for the Government of the Pacha.

The markets generally remain in a dull situation. There has been very little activity, and the less advanced quotations have gradually declined. Consols for money were on Thursday quoted $92\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$, and for the Account $91\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{1}{4}$.

Foreign stocks and railway shares have relapsed. A few of the miscellaneous securities have been sustained. Spanish Passives are $34\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$; Greek, $30\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$; Mexican, $37\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$; and Turkish Consolidated, $46\frac{1}{2}$ to 47.

The Commercial Union Finance Company have jumped up to 4 to $\frac{1}{2}$ prem. on the success of a recent trial. New Companies are talked of, but it would be wise to delay their introduction until the turn of the year.

The Merchant Trading Banking Company have induced Messrs. H. & J. Johnstone to amalgamate their large agency business with this institution, and the result has been an advance in the shares of the former to 7 to $7\frac{1}{2}$ prem. through the event.

MEETINGS OF LEARNED SOCIETIES NEXT WEEK.

MONDAY.

MEDICAL SOCIETY—At 8.30 P.M. Lettsomian Lecture.—"On Midwifery and Diseases of Women." By Dr. Routh.

BRITISH ARCHITECTS—At 8 P.M.

TUESDAY.

PATHOLOGICAL SOCIETY—At 8 P.M.

INSTITUTION OF CIVIL ENGINEERS—At 8 P.M. 1. Renewed Discussion upon Mr. Morshead's paper on "Duty of the Cornish Pumping Engines." 2. "Lambeth Bridge." By Mr. Peter William Barlow, F.R.S., M.I.C.E.

ANTHROPOLOGICAL SOCIETY—At 8 P.M.

WEDNESDAY.

SOCIETY OF ARTS—At 8 P.M. "On Magneto-Electricity, and its Application to Lighthouse Purposes." By F. H. Holmes, Esq.

GEOLOGICAL SOCIETY—At 8 P.M. 1. "On the Correlation of the Oligocene Deposits of Belgium, Germany, and Southern England." By Herr Adolf von Koenen. 2. "On the Liassic Strata of the Neighbourhood of Belfast." By Ralph Tate, Esq., F.G.S. 3. "On Palaeozoic Strata in the Vicinity of the Bosphorus." By Mr. W. R. Swan.

PHARMACEUTICAL—At 8 P.M. 1. "On a New Kind of Matico." By Professor Bentley. 2. "On the Acetic Acids of the Three Pharmacopoeias." By Henry Deane, F.L.S. 3. "Upon the Administration of Bismuth in a Soluble Form." By C. R. C. Tichborne, F.C.S. 4. "On Goa Powder." By Mr. David S. Kemp. 5. "Note on the Recovery of Essential Oils from their Watery Solution." By Mr. T. B. Groves. 6. "Note on the Root-Bark of Calisaya." By John Eliot Howard, F.L.S. 7. "Note on *Cassia morchata*." By Daniel Hanbury, F.L.S.

THURSDAY.

CHEMICAL—At 8 P.M. 1. "Essential Oils." By Dr. Gladstone. 2. "New Mode of Preparing Zinc-ethyl." By Drs. Frankland and Duppa.

LINNEAN—8 P.M.

FRIDAY.

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY—At 8.15 P.M. 1. "Our Elder Brethren, the Frisians, their Language and Literature, as Illustrative of those of England." 2. "Traces of a Primary Root *fng* or *fi* in Indo-Teutonic Languages."

LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS FOR THE WEEK.

- Adventures of Alfán; or, the Magic Amulet. Cr. 8vo., 5s.
 Andersen (H. C.), The Ice Maiden. Illustrated. Cr. 8vo., 10s. 6d.
 Stories and Tales. Cr. 8vo., 5s.
 Arabian Nights' Entertainments. Arranged for Children by Hon. Mrs. Sugden. Fcap., 5s.
 Autobiography of an English Detective. By "Waters." 2 vols. Cr. 8vo., 21s.
 Ballantyne (R. W.), Gascoigne, the Sandal Wood Trader. Cr. 8vo., 5s.
 Baptista: a Quiet Story. Fcap., 6s.
 Bel Demonio. By Paul Feval. Fcap., 2s.
 Bonar (Rev. Dr. H.), Family Sermons. New edit. Cr. 8vo., 6s.
 God's Way of Peace. New edit. 18mo., 9d. and 1s. 6d.
 Boys (E.), Narrative in France and Flanders. Cr. 8vo., 10s. 6d.
 Buchanan (Dr. J.), Analogy as a Guide to Truth. 8vo., 10s. 6d.
 Caliptus (G.), Life and Correspondence. By Rev. W. G. Dowding. Cr. 8vo., 8s. 6d.
 Cameron (Jane), Memoirs of. By a Prison Matron. 2 vols. Cr. 8vo., 21s.
 Children (The) of Blackberry Hollow. 18mo., 2s. 6d.
 Chronicles of a Garden. By Henrietta Wilson. Cr. 8vo., 5s.
 Cooper (J. F.), Oak Openings. New edit. Fcap., 1s.
 Deacon (E.), Law and Practice of Bankruptcy. 3rd edit. By A. G. Langley. 2 vols. 8vo., 40s.
 Dunster (Rev. H. P.), Historical Tales of Lancastrian Times. Fcap., 5s.
 Ellicott (Bp.), St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. 3rd edit. 8vo., 8s. 6d.
 Eton School Days. Cr. 8vo., 10s. 6d.
 Evangelical Almanac, 1864. Fcap., 1s.
 Evans (E. B.), Morning and Evening Services for Households. Cr. 8vo. 1s. 6d.
 Falloon (Rev. W. M.), Things in Heaven and Things on Earth. 4th edit. Cr. 8vo., 2s.
 Faustus, his Life, Death, and Doom. Cr. 8vo., 7s. 6d.
 Finlayson (J.), Surnames and Sirenames. 8vo., 2s. 6d.
 Fireside Chats with the Youngsters. 16mo., 3s. 6d.
 Galbraith and Houghton's Scientific Manuals.—Metalloids. By J. Apjohn. Fcap., 7s. 6d.
 Garden Oracle, 1864. Fcap., 1s.
 George Stanley; or, Life in the Woods. By J. C. Geikie. Fcap., 3s. 6d.
 God's Unspeakable Gift. 3rd edit. Fcap., 5s.
 Golden Ladder (The). By Author of "Wide, Wide World." New edit. Fcap., 3s. 6d.
 Hallett Family (The): a Story for the Young. 18mo., 1s.
 Handy Andy. By S. Lover. New edit. Fcap., 2s.
 Hannah (Rev. J.), Bampton Lectures, 1863. 8vo., 10s. 6d.
 Hannah Thurston. By Bayard Taylor. 3 vols. Post 8vo., £1. 11s. 6d.
 Hawthorne (N.), Our Old Home. New edit. 2 vols. Post 8vo., 21s.
 Hayes (W.) and Jarman (T.), Concise Forms of Wills. 6th edit. Cr. 8vo., 21s.
 Historic Character of the Pentateuch Vindicated. 3rd edit. 8vo., 6s.
 Hodge (Rev. A. A.), Outlines of Theology. Cr. 8vo., 6s. 6d.
 Horace's Art of Poetry. Translated by Rev. D. Bagot. Fcap., 2s. 6d.
 Is the Doctrine of Transmutation Scriptural? Fcap., 3s.
 James (G. P. R.), Russell. Cheap edit. Fcap., 1s.
 Jameson (Capt.), Historic Record of the 79th Regiment. Cr. 8vo., 7s. 6d.
 Jennings (H.), Precious Truths. Fcap., 3s. 6d.
 Jukes (J. B.), School Manual of Geology. Fcap., 4s.
 Kalisch (Dr.), Hebrew Grammar. Part 1, Key to. 8vo., 5s.
 Keeping Afloat: a Novel. Cr. 8vo., 10s. 6d.
 Kirkus (Rev. W.), English Grammar. Fcap., 1s.
 Lepsius (C. R.), Standard Alphabet. 2nd edit. 8vo., 3s.
 Levi (Leoni), International Commercial Law. New edit. 2 vols. Royal 8vo., £1. 15s.
 McCosh (Rev. J.), Method of Divine Government. 8th edit. 8vo., 10s. 6d.
 M'Levy (J.), Curiosities of Crime. 2nd Series. Fcap., 1s.
 Man of the Hour. By A. Gladstone. 2 vols. Cr. 8vo., 21s.
 Milnes (R. M.), Poetical Works, Selections from. Fcap., 6s.
 Mitchell (E.), Streamlets from the Fountain. 18mo., 1s. 6d.
 More Fun for our Little Friends. 4to., 5s.
 Mylne (G. W.), Plain Words. Vol. 4. 12mo., 2s.
 Mystical Philosophy and Spirit Manifestations. Cr. 8vo., 6s.
 Naval and Military Library.—Gentleman Jack. Fcap., 2s.
 Nieritz (G.), Busy Hands and Patient Hearts. 16mo., 3s. 6d.
 Ollendorff's German Method. By H. W. Dulcken. 2nd edit. Fcap., 5s. 6d.
 Oxenden (Rev. A.), Cottage Readings. New edit. Fcap., 3s. 6d.
 Post (The) of Honour. 3rd edit. Fcap., 5s.
 Queen Mab. By Julia Kavanagh. 2nd edit. 3 vols. Cr. 8vo., 31s. 6d.
 Railway Library.—Zingra, the Gipsy. Fcap., 1s.
 Rogers (B. B.), The Mosaic Records. Cr. 8vo., 4s.
 Safe Compass (The), and How it Points. By Rev. R. Newton. 16mo., 2s. 6d.
 Shakespeare. By W. G. Clark and W. A. Wright. Vol. 3. 8vo., 10s. 6d.
 Smiles (S.), Industrial Biography. Cr. 8vo., 6s.
 Spring (A.) and Summer in Lapland. Cr. 8vo., 10s. 6d.
 Stanesby (S.), Floral Gift. Illustrated. 16mo., 14s.
 Stevenson (Rev. J.), Expulsion of the English from Normandy. Royal 8vo., 10s.
 Stronges (The) of Netherstronge. By E. J. May. Cr. 8vo., 10s. 6d.
 Sunbeam Stories. Vol. 2. Fcap., 3s. 6d.
 Syme (Prof. J.), Principles of Surgery. 5th edit. 8vo., 12s.
 Terrible Woman (A). By Austyn Graham. 2 vols. Post 8vo., 21s.
 Thoughts on the Church Catechism. Part 2. Fcap., 5s. 6d.
 Timbs (J.), Knowledge for the Time. Fcap., 5s.
 Truths for the Day of Life and Hour of Death. Fcap., 5s.
 Tuttielt (Rev. L.), Gems of Thought in the Sunday Services, Advent to Easter. Fcap., 1s. 6d.
 Counsels of a Godfather. Fcap., 3s. 6d.
 Two Cousins (The). By H. S. Engestrom. 18mo., 1s.
 What is Truth? A Life Problem. Fcap., 3s. 6d.
 White (Rev. L. B.), English Sacred Poetry of the Olden Time. Square 8vo., 10s. 6d.
 Wise Sayings of the Great and Good. Fcap., 5s.
 Wordsworth's Poems for the Young. New edit. Imp. 16mo., 6s.
 Work in the World. Fcap., 3s. 6d.
 Yonge (C. D.), History of the British Navy. 2 vols. 8vo., £2. 2s.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

ROYAL ENGLISH OPERA, COVENT GARDEN.

Under the Management of Miss Louisa Pyne and Mr. W. Harrison.
 Doors open at Half-past Six. Commence at Seven.
 "Another New Opera, and (need we add) another Brilliant Success."—*Times*, Nov. 24th.
 On MONDAY, November 30th, and during the week, *BLANCHE DE NEVERS*. Music by M. W. Balfe. Libretto by John Brougham. Founded on one of the most Popular Dramatic Romances of the day. Supported by the following Artists:—Misses Louisa Pyne, Anna Hiles, Emma Heywood; Messrs. W. H. Weiss, H. Corri, A. Cook, A. St. Albyn, J. Rouse, and W. Harrison. Conductor, Mr. A. Mellon. New Scenery by Mr. T. Grieco. Dances arranged by Mr. W. H. Payne.
 To conclude, each evening, with the Second Act of Wallace's Popular Opera, *THE DESERT FLOWER*.
 Box-office open daily, from 10 till 5. No charge for booking or fees to box-keepers.

THE UNIVERSAL PENNY!

ONE of the most useful articles in which this little Coin can be profitably invested, is in purchasing a Penny Packet of *HARPER TWELVETREES' GLYCERINE SOAP POWDER*, by which a Pound of capital Scouring Soap may be made, possessing remarkable lathering properties, and the use of which renders the Washing of Clothes a comparatively easy operation.—Manufactory—Bromley-by-Bow, London, E.

THE Rev. Dr. WILLOCK, late Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, Lecturer and Examiner in Mathematics, Natural Philosophy, and Divinity, now residing in London, takes PUPILS to prepare for University honours, and the Military and Indian Competitive Examinations.
 Dr. WILLOCK'S method of teaching has been attended with an uniform and, in some instances, remarkable success, many of his Pupils having obtained the highest distinctions, including Fellowships in Trinity College, Dublin.—Address, 29, Chepstow-place, Bayswater.

ARUNDEL SOCIETY.—THE ANNUAL PUBLICATIONS for 1863 are in course of delivery to those Members whose subscriptions are not in arrear.—24, Old Bond-street.

ARUNDEL SOCIETY.—A NEW CLASS OF MEMBERS, called ASSOCIATES, unlimited in number, has been created. Copies of the Rules explaining the privileges of Associates, and List of Publications for sale, may be obtained on application to the Assistant Secretary, personally or by letter, at 24, Old Bond-street, W.

ARUNDEL SOCIETY.—NOW READY. Two new Occasional (or extra) Chromo-lithographs, viz.: "THE CONVERSION OF HERMOGENES," after Mantegna; price, to members, 15s., to strangers, 20s.; and "THE ANNUNCIATION," after Fra Angelico, price, to members, 10s., to strangers, 12s. 6d. Members and the Public are invited to inspect these, and the COLLECTION OF WATER COLOUR DRAWINGS, at the Rooms of the Society, 24, Old Bond-street, W.

THE GREAT EASTERN RAILWAY COMPANY

FOUR-AND-A-HALF PER CENT. PREFERENCE STOCK.

The GREAT EASTERN RAILWAY COMPANY are prepared to receive applications for sums of £100, or upwards, of the above Stock, created under the powers of their Act of 1862, bearing a fixed Preferential Interest of 4½ per cent. per annum.

Interest commences from the date of payment.

Applications to be made, either personally or by letter, to the undersigned.

Bishopsgate Terminus, November, 1863.

J. B. OWEN, Secretary.

THE GREAT WATER-SPRINGS AT GRAYS.—

The SOUTH ESSEX WATERWORKS COMPANY has the sole control of the springs at Grays, yielding immense volumes of the finest water, which it is intended ultimately to bring to London.

The works at Brentwood and Warley are in operation, and the mains to Romford are nearly completed.

Applications for the remaining shares to be made to Messrs. Bragg & Stockdale, 6, Throgmorton-street, or to

21, Gresham-street, E.C.

M. BEALE, Secretary.

GREAT BRITAIN MUTUAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

Empowered by Special Act of Parliament, 25 & 26 Vict. cap. 74.

WILLIAM HENRY DICKSON, Esq., Chancellor House, Tunbridge Wells, Chairman.

T. B. TANQUERAY WILLAUME, Esq., New Broad-street, Deputy-Chairman. This Society is established on the tried and approved principle of Mutual Assurance. The funds are accumulated for the exclusive benefit of the members, under their own immediate superintendence and control. The profits are divided annually.

101, Cheapside, E.C.

C. L. LAWSON, Sec.

CONFIDENT LIFE ASSURANCE AND LOAN COMPANY (Limited). Established 1855. Capital £100,000. All kinds of Assurance and Annuity business transacted. Policies made payable during the lifetime of the insurer. Sick policies guaranteeing from 5s. to £5 per week during sickness. On the recommendation of the eminent Actuary, ALEXANDER GLENN FINLAISON, Esq., a Bonus has been declared to the Policyholders entitled, averaging Eighty per cent. on the value of the Policies. The usual notices will be forthwith issued.—By order of the Board,

G. W. GIDLEY LAKE, Secretary.

Chief Office—13, Finsbury-place South, London, E.C.

ACTIVE AGENTS WANTED.

ALFRED WEBB MILES.

Everybody knows that Mr. MILES REMOVED from BOND-STREET to 73, BROOK-STREET, HANOVER-SQUARE, in 1859.

The SIXTEEN-SHILLING TROUSERS (originated by him) in all the new patterns for winter. "BETTER THAN EVER."

SPECIAL NOTICE TO GENTLEMEN.

A. W. MILES has most respectfully to announce that the stock in the various departments of his Establishment

IS NOW REPLETE FOR OVERCOATS.

Vestings, Bedford Cords, and Scarlet Waterproof Cloths, for Hunting. The Wool-dyed Black and Blue Frock Coats, 50s. A choice of fifty pieces of Indestructible Woaded West of England Cloths.

ESTABLISHED 1841.—ONLY ADDRESS.

DINNEFORD'S PURE FLUID MAGNESIA has been during twenty-five years emphatically sanctioned by the Medical Profession, and universally accepted by the Public as the best remedy for Acidity of the Stomach, Heartburn, Headache, Gout, and Indigestion, and as a mild Aperient for delicate constitutions, more especially for Ladies and Children. It is prepared, in a state of perfect purity and of uniform strength, by DINNEFORD and CO., 172 New Bond street, London; and sold by all respectable Chemists throughout the world.

THE VINTAGE WINE COMPANY supply the Public, at a small advance on Wholesale prices, with every description of WINES.

	per doz.		per doz.
THE VINTAGE SHERRY	18s.	THE VINTAGE PORT	20s.
THE VINTAGE CLARET	13s.	THE VINTAGE CHAMPAGNE	27s.

14, BLOOMSBURY-STREET (four doors south of New Oxford-street).

QUITE NEW.

MR. and Mrs. GHOST (previous to their departure) have honoured the Artists of the LONDON STEREOSCOPIC COMPANY for sittings for their CARTE DE VISITE, and these remarkably successful Portraits were (by permission) published on Monday, the 10th October last. Price 1s.; Stereoscopic, 1s. 6d. Free by post for stamps. 54, Cheapside, and 110, Regent-street.